Library of Princeton
DEC.12 1890
Theological Seminary

Division BX1735
Section L433
No.

CHAPTERS

FROM THE

RELIGIOUS HISTORY OF SPAIN

CONNECTED WITH THE INQUISITION.

CENSORSHIP OF THE PRESS—MYSTICS AND ILLUMINATI—ENDEMONIADAS—EL SANTO NIÑO DE LA GUARDIA—BRIANDA DE BARDAXÍ.

BY

HENRY CHARLES LEA, LL.D.

PHILADELPHIA:
LEA BROTHERS & CO.
1890.

Entered according to Act of Congress in the year 1890, by
LEA BROTHERS & CO.,
In the Office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington, D.C.
All rights reserved.

DORNAN, PRINTER,
100 North Seventh Street, Philadelphia.

PREFACE.

In prosecuting researches for a history of the Spanish Inquisition, some phases of its activity have seemed to me worthy of more elaborate treatment than could be accorded to them in a general narrative. These are investigated in the following essays, and I trust that they may be found to throw light on some of the very curious problems connected with the remarkable vicissitudes, intellectual and material, through which the Spanish race has passed. The place occupied by Spain in the history of European civilization is unique in many respects, and the causes and consequences of its peculiar development suggest numerous questions full of interest and instruction to the enquirer.

In the essay on Censorship I have departed somewhat from the sphere of purely religious history, but in Spain Church and State were so intimately connected that in some fields of activity it is impossible to treat them separately. In its origin Censorship was devised by the Church to preserve purity of faith; then the papacy made use of it to strengthen the defences of the temporal power, and the State naturally took hold of the machinery thus created to serve its own purposes. No survey of the subject could be complete that did not consider it in both aspects.

For the considerable amount of new and inedited material placed at my disposal I am indebted to the custodians of the Bodleian Library, Oxford, of the Royal Library of Copenhagen and of the Royal Library of the University of Halle, as well as to General Don Vicente Riva Palacio of Mexico, to the late Señor Don José Amador de los Rios of Madrid, and especially to David Fergusson, Esq., who has most liberally given me free access to the very interesting collection of the records of the Mexican Inquisition made by him during a prolonged residence in the City of Mexico.

PHILADELPHIA, August, 1890.

CONTENTS.

CENSORSHIP OF THE PRESS.

PAGE

THE MIDDLE AGES.

Censorship in the Early Church 15
Prohibition of Vernacular Scripture in the Thirteenth Century 16
Supervision of Booksellers at the Universities . . 17
Censorship in Castile in the Fifteenth Century . . 18
in Aragon in the Fourteenth Century . 18
Vernacular Scriptures permitted 19

RUDIMENTARY CENSORSHIP.

Censorship at first not a function of the Inquisition . 20
Ferdinand and Isabella's Law of 1502 . . . 22
Gradual assumption of Censorship by the Inquisition . 24

THE REFORMATION.

Stimulus to Censorship caused by the Reformation . 26
Propagandist Efforts of the Reformers . . . 27
Criticism suppressed—Case of Erasmus . . . 29

THE SPANISH ERASMISTS.

Opposition excited by the Translation of the *Enchiridion* 36
Contest before the Inquisition 40
Final condemnation of the works of Erasmus . . 42

THE SCRIPTURES.

Vernacular Versions of the Bible current 44
Prohibited in 1551 48

PAGE

Heretical Bibles in the Ancient Tongues . . . 50
Minuteness of Censorial Criticism 51
Vernacular Versions—their complete Suppression . 53

ORGANIZATION OF CENSORSHIP.

Enforcement of the Law of 1502—Licences to print . 56
Gradual increase of Rigor 58
Discovery of Heresy—Pragmatic Sanction of 1558 . 59
Double Censorship, by the State and by the Inquisition—the Index Expurgatorius 63
Enforcement of the Law entrusted to the Inquisition . 65
Cases of Jean Fesque and Hanz Brunsvique . . 68

FUNCTIONS OF THE INQUISITION.

Exclusion of Episcopal Jurisdiction 72
Perfection of Inquisitorial machinery 73
Process of *Calificacion* 74
Expurgation—The Indexes 77
Sensitiveness of Expurgation 80
Political use of Censorship 83
Supervision of importations—*Visitas de Navios* . . 84

LICENCES FOR READERS.

Successively granted and withdrawn by the Popes . 92
Independent jurisdiction asserted by the Spanish Inquisition 93

INDEPENDENCE OF ROME.

The Spanish Inquisition asserts exclusive control . 97
Its Quarrels with the Roman Congregations . . 101
Case of Mateo Moya 102
of Juan Bautista Poza 103
of the *Plomos del Sacromonte* 108
of the Catechism of Mésengui 118

THE REGALISTAS.

Conflicts between the State and the Church . . 124
Papal use of Censorship 126
Resistance of Philip IV. 127

PAGE

Case of Macanáz 131
of Manuel Santos, *alias* Berrocosa . . . 134
Carlos III. restricts inquisitorial Censorship . . 137

CENSORSHIP BY THE STATE.

Examination for licence to print 139
The *Tassa*, or price 141
Organization of machinery of Censorship . . . 143
Responsibility entailed by Censorship . . . 144
Minuteness of supervision 147
Aragon, Catalonia and Valencia 151
Navarre 156

THE REVOLUTION.

Reforms of Carlos III. 157
Removal of Prohibition of Vernacular Scriptures . 160
Reaction caused by the French Revolution . . . 163
Journalism 165
Rigorous law of 1805 168
Córtes of Cadiz proclaim freedom of the press . . 172
Reaction under the Restoration 175
Revolution of 1820—Reaction under the French occupation 177
Enforced liberalism of Cristina 180
Existing press laws 183

THE INFLUENCE OF CENSORSHIP.

Brilliancy of the Sixteenth Century in Spain . . 187
Views of Señor Menendez y Pelayo 190
Obstacles caused by Censorship—Garibay—Illescas . 193
Dangers of authorship 198
Abuse of power by the Inquisition 204
Burdens imposed on Literature 206
Effects of repression—Decadence of Literature . . 208
Its Resurrection 210

MYSTICS AND ILLUMINATI.

PAGE

DEVELOPMENT OF MYSTICISM.

Ancient and Medieval Mystics 213
Causes stimulating Spanish Mysticism . . . 216
The *Beatas* 217
Growth of orthodox and heterodox Mysticism . . 222
Practice of *Recojimiento*, or Mental Prayer . . . 223
Quietism 225
Pathological effects of Mental Prayer 227
Visions and Revelations 229
Miraculous powers 231

DANGERS OF MYSTICISM.

Doctrine of Impeccability 234
Illumination by the Holy Ghost 236
The Mediation of the Church unnecessary . . . 238
Pious Works superfluous 240
The Reformation renders suppression necessary . 244
The *Alumbrados* become heretics 245

PERSECUTION.

The *Alumbrados* of Pastrana 251
Case of María Cazalla 253
The Erasmists 255
Francisca Hernandez and Francisco Ortiz . . . 259
Archbishop Carranza 270
Gregorio Lopez 280
Santa Teresa de Ávila 282
San Juan de la Cruz—Jerónimo Gracian . . . 286
The Jesuits 290
The Alumbrados of Llerena 295
Growth of Mysticism—The Mystics of Seville . . 300
The Nuns of San Plácido 309
Decline of Mysticism under Persecution . . . 319
Madre María de Agreda 321
Miguel de Molinos 327

PAGE

IMPOSTORS.

Difficulty of distinguishing between Saints and Impostors 328
Case of Magdalena de la Cruz 330
Multiplication of Mystics 336
María de la Visitacion 338
Increased Activity of the Inquisition 342
The Impostors of Seville 344
Madre Luisa de Carrion 352
The Impostors increase 358
Mexican cases—Joseph Bruñon de Vertiz . . . 362
Cases in Lima—Angela Carranza 375
Madrid *auto de fé* of 1680 383

MOLINISTAS.

Condemnation of Molinos 384
Persecution of the Molinists or Quietists . . . 385
Cases in the latter half of the Eighteenth Century . 395
Mexican Cases—Eusebio de Villaroja . . . 400
Pedro Fernandez Ybarraran . . 407
Spanish cases in the Nineteenth Century . . . 413
Sor Patrocinio 416
Recent cases 421

ENDEMONIADAS.

Belief in Diabolical Possession 423
Regulation of Exorcism 425
Imposture 427
The Endemoniadas of Queretaro 428
Fray Manuel Gorvea 435

EL SANTO NIÑO DE LA GUARDIA.

Torquemada's Desire for the Expulsion of the Jews . . 437
Belief in the Crucifixion of Christian Children by Jews . 439

PAGE

Sacrilege and sorcery with the Host 444
Case of the Santo Niño 448
Use made of it to procure the Expulsion of the Jews . . 460
Canonization of Children martyred by Jews 461
Legend and cult of the Santo Niño 463

BRIANDA DE BARDAXÍ.

Hypersensitiveness of Orthodoxy 469
Trial and Punishment of Brianda de Bardaxí . . . 471

APPENDIX OF DOCUMENTS.

I. Visitas de Navios por el Santo Oficio 481
II. Decree of Philip V., March 28, 1715 483
III. Retractation of the Maestre Juan de Villalpando . 484
IV. Auto de Fé of Fray Francisco García Calderon . . 488
V. Application for the Arrest of Josepha de San Luis Beltran 490
VI. Act of Accusation against Joseph Bruñon de Vertiz . 492
VII. Summary of Evidence against Francisco Fernandez . 494
VIII. Auto de Fé of Joseph Luis Navarro 501
IX. Auto de Fé of María de los Dolores 505

CHAPTERS FROM THE

RELIGIOUS HISTORY OF SPAIN.

CENSORSHIP

OF THE PRESS.

THE MIDDLE AGES.

Power, whether spiritual or temporal, necessarily seeks its own preservation. The same spirit which leads it to put down armed insurrection prompts it to suppress by force all expressions of dissidence and all mutterings of discontent. Nor is this merely the instinct of selfishness, for the ruler, whether king or pope, is easily persuaded that his rule is beneficent and his creed the sole hope of sinful humanity. The toleration of free speech and free thought is too essentially modern an idea, and is as yet too imperfectly reduced to practice, for us to waste surprise on its non-existence in past ages.

The earliest censorship, and perhaps the most sweeping, is that contained in the Apostolical Constitutions, which purport to be written by St. Clement of Rome at the dictation of the Apostles. These prefigure the Index by forbidding the Christian to read any books of the Gentiles—the Scriptures should suffice for the believer.[1] As yet, Christianity had no power to enforce its commands, and was obliged to rely on persuasion; but it soon afterward became dominant in the Roman world, and, through the development of its theology, was split into warring factions. The same proscriptive spirit

[1] Constitutt. Apostt. Lib. I. c. vii. Abstine te ab omnibus gentilium libris. Quid enim tibi cum externis libris vel legibus vel falsis prophetis qui quidem leves a fide abducunt?

naturally led the party in possession of the ecclesiastical organization to urge the secular authority to destroy the books of its antagonists. Constantine responded with an edict which may be regarded as the prototype of a long series, not yet ended, of laws to fetter the expression of human opinion. Under threat of death all possessors of Arian writings were commanded to surrender them for burning in public.[1] His example was imitated by his successors in decrees too numerous to recapitulate, whenever an old heresy became peculiarly obnoxious or a new one emerged to invite repression. It is sufficient to allude to two expressions of intolerance which show how eagerly Church and State rivalled each other in furnishing unhappy precedents to be quoted and imitated by priest and king down to our own times. In 447 St. Leo I., in his epistle to Torribio of Asturias, lays down the rule that all Priscillianist books, the MSS. of Scripture which the heretics had vitiated by interpolations, and the apocryphal gospels, are not only to be forbidden but are to be collected and burnt. It is the duty, he says, of the bishops to attend to this; if any of them neglect it they are to be regarded as heretics, for he who does not recall others from error proves that he errs himself.[2] If in this the popes of the sixteenth century saw a model to be adapted to the necessities of the times, the civil lawyers found justification for the punishment of those who printed heretical books in the authoritative precedent of Justinian, who in 536 prescribed amputation of the hand for all who copied Nestorian writings.[3]

When the dawn of modern civilization commenced to penetrate the obscurity of the Dark Ages recourse was naturally had to the same methods. In Aragon the earliest action was directed against vernacular versions of Scripture. The Church was satisfied with the Latin Vulgate; it authorized no translations into modern tongues and preferred that popular

[1] Sozomeni Hist. Eccles. Lib. I. cap. xxi.

[2] Leonis PP. I. Epist. XV. c. xv. xvi.

[3] Authent. Collat. IV. Tit. xxi. (Novell. 42) cap. I.

instruction should come from learned priests who could explain obscurities in orthodox fashion. The earnest sects of Cathari and Waldenses, whose growth was a real danger to the establishment, were ardent students of Scripture and found in it a potent instrument of propagandism. The Cathari, who rejected nearly the whole of the Old Testament, had translations of the New. The Waldenses had versions of the whole Bible. The suppression of these dangerous books was evidently one of the necessary measures for suppressing the heresies which found support in them, and the Cort of Tarragona in 1234 adopted a decree of King Jayme I. forbidding the possession by any one of any portion of the Old or New Testament in Romance.[1]

A censorship established soon after this over the booksellers in the universities shows how early the trade in books was regarded as requiring closer supervision than that in other merchandise. Alfonso X. in his code known as *Las Siete Partidas*, about 1265, directed that in all centres of learning there should be *estacionarios* keeping books to hire to the students for the purpose of copying. To keep an *estacion* required the licence of the rector of the university, who was instructed before granting it to cause the stock of books to be examined as to their legibility and correctness; if lacking in these respects the bookseller was refused a licence until his books should be duly amended.[2] So, when Jayme II. founded the University of Lérida, in 1300, while he favored booksellers by granting them exemption from taxes and from secular jurisdiction, both civil and criminal, except in capital cases,

[1] Constitutions de Cathalunya, Lib. I. Tit. i. cap. 2 (Barcelona, 1588, p. 7). Martene et Durand Ampl. Collect. VII. 123.

In 1229 the Council of Toulouse, under the presidency of the Cardinal-Legate Romano, prohibited all laymen from possessing any portion of the Scriptures, even in Latin. Even the Breviary and Hours of the Virgin in the vernacular were strictly forbidden.—Concil. Tolosan. ann. 1229 c. 14 (Harduin. VII. 178).

[2] Partidas, II. xxi. 11.

he required that the texts which they provided for students should be examined, and he decreed punishment for any lack of correctness.[1] These provisions were dictated by an enlightened desire to foster science and letters, but they are ominous of a time when a paternal government should confine human thought within the narrowest bounds in its anxiety to limit the contamination of error.

The energies of Castile were too largely absorbed by civil strife and the work of the Reconquest to permit an intellectual activity provocative of repression, and until the fifteenth century literature remained without interference. The first instance of censorship on record was exercised on the library of the Marquis of Villena, after his death in 1434. As a man of learning and science he had dabbled in occult arts and had earned the reputation of a skilful magician. At the command of King Juan II. his books were examined by the celebrated Lope de Barrientos, subsequently Bishop of Cuenca, who, by the royal order, publicly burnt such as were deemed objectionable, for books on magic were always under the ban of the Church.[2] A more significant case was that of Pedro de Osma, a respected professor of Salamanca, who in 1479 was condemned by the Council of Alcalá for heresies respecting confession and the papal power to remit the pains of purgatory; he was required to abjure in public, holding a lighted candle, and the book in which his errors were set forth was ordered to be burnt by the secular authorities, who promptly obeyed.[3]

Aragon had manifested a more active intellectual development and had been blest with an Inquisition watchful over aberrations from the faith. In 1316 the inquisitor, Juan de Llotger, summoned an assembly of experts at Tarragona,

[1] Villanueva, Viage Literario, T. XXI. pp. 29, 226.

[2] La Puente, Epitome de la Cronica de Juan II., Lib. III. cap. xxiv. (Madrid, 1678, p. 184).—Ticknor's History of Spanish Literature, App. C.

[3] D'Argentré, Collect. Judic. de novis Erroribus, I. II. 299.—Menendez y Pelayo, Heterodoxos Españoles, I. 788.

which condemned the tracts of Arnaldo de Vilanova on Spiritual Franciscanism, in a sentence prefiguring the methods by which the prohibition of books was subsequently enforced. All who possessed the heretical writings were commanded to surrender them within ten days under pain of excommunication, a contumacious endurance of which for a year subjected them to prosecution for heresy.[1] Towards the close of the century that earnest inquisitor, Nicholas Eymerich, procured the condemnation of a number of books, including some twenty of Raymond Lully and several of Ramon de Tarraga.[2]

Curiously enough, this vigilance did not extend to the Scriptures, which, as we have seen, were the earliest object of censorship. In 1269 Alfonso X. caused a translation in Castilian to be made of the Bible, a copy of which, in five folio volumes, is preserved in the Escorial, together with portions of other versions of the fifteenth century.[3] In 1422 the Master of Calatrava, Don Luis Gonzalez de Guzman, ordered Rabbi Moyses aben Ragel to translate for him the Old Testament, giving as a reason that the current Castilian versions were not to be depended on for fidelity and were antiquated in language. In a very quaint correspondence, Rabbi Moyses accepted the task, after a discreet show of disinclination; with the aid of some Franciscans and Dominicans he furnished it with Catholic glosses, and finished the work in 1430.[4] During the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries a number of versions were executed in Catalan—one of them by the

[1] Menendez y Pelayo, Heterodoxos Españoles, I. 777.

[2] Eymerici Directorium Inquis., pp. 255, 313, 314 (Ed. Venet. 1607). It is, however, a disputed question to the present day whether or not the papal bull condemning Lully's books was a forgery of Eymerich's.

[3] Villanueva, De la Leccion de la Sagrada Escritura, pp. 9, 12-13 (Valencia, 1791).

[4] Villanueva, Append. III. pp. cxli. *sqq.* A splendid illuminated MS. of this version still exists, formerly belonging to the Conde Duque de Olivares. It is significant of the change which had occurred that the all-powerful minister of Philip IV. felt himself obliged to procure from the Inquisition, January 18, 1624, a licence to possess and read this MS. (Ib. p. cxxxix.).

Carthusian, Doctor Bonifacio Ferrer, brother of San Vicente Ferrer, who is supposed to have assisted him. Of this an edition was printed at Valencia, in 1478, at the expense of a German merchant named Philip Vizlant, carefully revised by the Inquisitor Jayme Borell.[1] This was on the eve of the proscription of the vernacular Scriptures, and the contrast is worth noting between medieval toleration and modern intolerance.

RUDIMENTARY CENSORSHIP.

At this period commenced the change which was to effect so profound a transformation in the Spanish character. In 1480, Isabella, after prolonged hesitation, assented to the establishment of the Inquisition in Castile, and persecution for opinion's sake gradually organized itself until it became in time one of the chief social forces. Yet how little it was her intention to stunt the intellectual development of her people is seen in a law of the same year which is an expression of her constant effort to diffuse culture throughout her dominions. By this law books were relieved of the oppressive *alcavala*, or tax of ten per cent. on sales; in order to encourage the merchants who brought from abroad "many and good books every day" all duties, imposts, and tolls of every kind were removed from them, and the municipalities were forbidden to levy any taxes upon them.[2] The coincidence of two such measures is a wholesome illustration of human blindness in the adoption of methods for the accomplishment of lofty ends.

For awhile the Inquisition found ample occupation for its energies in the work for which it was created—that of pen-

[1] Villanueva, p. 8; Append. II. pp. cxxxii. *sqq*.

[2] Novisima Recopilacion, Lib. VIII. Tit. xv. ley 1.

ancing and burning the multitude of *conversos* or Jewish Christians—nor was the censorship of the press considered to be one of its functions. In the *Instrucciones* of Seville, 1484, of Valladolid, 1488, of Ávila, 1498, and of Seville, 1500, which formed the constitution and code of procedure of the Holy Office, there is no allusion to any duty incumbent upon it in watching and supervising the issues of the press. It is true that Torquemada is said to have burnt in 1490 a number of Hebrew Bibles by order of Ferdinand and Isabella, and subsequently in an *auto de fé* at Salamanca more than six thousand volumes described as books of magic or infected with Jewish errors,[1] but such exhibitions of zeal appear to have been within the province of any person of position and influence. Ximenes, while yet merely Archbishop of Toledo, and without authority over the metropolitan city of Hernando de Talavera, Archbishop of Granada, when engaged, by permission of the latter, in 1499, in converting the Moors of Granada, collected five thousand Arabic books, many of them splendidly ornamented and illuminated, and in spite of the entreaty of friends who begged of him the priceless MSS., he burnt them all on the public square, except those on medicine, which he reserved and finally deposited in his University of Alcalá.[2] The undefined condition of the questions concerning books is well reflected in an inquisitorial manual printed in Valencia in 1494. The author quotes some of the older authorities to the effect that a prohibited book found in a man's possession is a proof of heresy; but he adds his opinion that additional evidence is requisite, for it may be in his house without his knowledge, or he may have procured it for the purpose of controverting it, as the Jews do with the gospels and Catholic doctors. Still, anyone finding heresy or error in a book is bound to burn it or to deliver it within

[1] Llorente, Hist. critique de l'Inquisition, I. 281.

[2] Gomez de Rebus gestis Francisci Ximenii, Lib. II. fol. 30*b*.—Luis de Mármol-Carvajal, Rebelion de los Moriscos, Lib. I. cap. xxiv.

eight days to the bishop or inquisitor, but there is no penalty alleged for neglect to do this except that it creates "violent suspicion" against him—and violent suspicion rendered prosecution necessary. Again, we are told that to write a heretic book is to be a heretic, but not so to receive one from a heretic and keep it.[1]

Although no heresy at this period threatened the Church, the increasing stream of books issuing from the press aroused a sense of the necessity of some supervision. The intellectual activity of Germany, in particular, and the mutterings of unaccustomed independence there, seemed to call for special watchfulness. In 1486, Berthold, Archbishop of Mainz, endeavored to establish a crude censorship in Mainz and Frankfort over books translated into the vernacular from foreign tongues;[2] and in 1501 Alexander VI. issued a bull instructing the German prelates to exercise a close supervision over printers.[3] So far as Germany was concerned this mandate seems to have been received with contemptuous indifference, but it aroused an echo in Spain, of all Christian lands the one in which it was least needed. In 1502 Ferdinand and Isabella responded with an elaborate law, the first which established a practical censorship of the press in Europe, and laid down the lines on which nearly all subsequent enactments were based. To Spain thus belongs the honor of organizing the system which was to exercise an influence so incomputable on the development of human intelligence. The uncompromising character of the Spanish temperament, which pursued its object regardless of consequences, saw at once, what was elsewhere only perceived by degrees, that any endeavor to set bounds to the multiplying products of the press could only be successful by a thorough system of minute surveillance.

[1] Albert. Repertorium Inquisit. *s. vv. Comburi, Detegitur, Probationes, Libri.*

[2] Gudeni Cod. Diplom. IV. 469.

[3] Raynald. Annal. ann. 1501, No. 36.

It thus was ordered that no book should be printed or imported or exposed for sale without examination and licence. In Valladolid and Ciudad Real this duty was imposed upon the president judges of the royal courts; in Toledo, Seville and Granada on their respective archbishops; in Búrgos on the bishop; in Salamanca and Zamora on the Bishop of Salamanca. These were required to appoint examiners of good repute and learning, who should be sworn to discharge their duty and should receive a just but moderate salary, not oppressive to booksellers and printers, who apparently were expected to defray the expenses. After a MS. had been licensed for printing the printed sheets were to be carefully compared with the original to see that no alterations had been made on the press. Any book printed or imported and offered for sale without such licence was to be seized and publicly burnt; the printer or vendor was declared incapable of longer carrying on the business; if he had sold copies before discovery he forfeited twice the price received for them, which was divided between the informer, the judge, and the fisc.[1]

Well adapted as was this to attain the object in view, it will be observed that there is no allusion to the Inquisition as

[1] Nueva Recop. Lib. I. Tit. vii. ley 23 (Novís. Recop. VIII xvi. 1). As printed in both these collections Granada is represented as under the censorship of both the presiding judge and the archbishop. In an abstract of the law, however, in a *Consulta del Concejo* presented to Carlos III. in 1761, Ciudad Real (or Villareal) is substituted for the first reference to Granada, and this I think must be correct (MSS. Royal Library of Copenhagen, No. 216 fol.).

In this same year, 1502, Isabella gave to the unhappy Moors of her dominions the alternative of exile or conversion. The *conversos* were allowed to retain all Arabic books on medicine, philosophy and history, and were ordered to surrender everything else. This command was but partially obeyed, and in 1511 Ferdinand issued a decree requiring them within fifty days to present for examination all Arabic books in their possession, under pain of confiscation and arbitrary personal punishment; the books on the excepted subjects were to be returned to them and all the rest were to be burnt (Colleccion de Documentos inéditos, T. XXXIX. p. 447).

concerned either in the investigation of books for heretical errors or in the punishment of delinquents. The Holy Office evidently was not considered as having any jurisdiction over the matter. Yet the growing authority of that institution as the special defender of the faith led it inevitably to enlarge its sphere of operations, and there seems to be no evidence that the judges and prelates made any special effort to discharge the duties imposed upon them by the law of 1502. Diego Deza acted as inquisitor general and not as Archbishop of Seville when he assailed Elio Antonio de Nebrija, the father of Spanish classical learning, and no question was raised as to his jurisdiction although the case practically involved the powerful Ximenes, then Archbishop of Toledo. In 1504 Nebrija was one of the scholars employed by Ximenes to prepare the text of the Complutensian Polyglot. In the performance of this task he undertook to correct the errors of the Vulgate—an effort which half a century before had been declared permissible in Rome when Lorenzo Valla triumphed over his enemies. To a narrow-minded bigot like Deza it seemed almost a sacrilege for a layman to presume to meddle with Scripture, and Nebrija was accused of preferring the rules of grammar to the definitions of orthodoxy. It was probably to the influence of Ximenes that he owed his escape from condemnation and personal ill-treatment; but even that powerful favor could not prevent his being forbidden to continue his work, rendering him the first of a long line of illustrious scholars whose genius was hampered by the obscurantism of theological pedants clothed with the tremendous and irresponsible power of the Inquisition. Fortunately for Nebrija, Deza was forced to resign in 1507 and was succeeded by Ximenes. Nebrija returned to Alcalá, resumed his labors, and was honored with the special friendship of the great cardinal.[1]

The Inquisition had not long to wait before its jurisdiction

[1] Estudio del Maestre Elio Antonio de Nebrija, Madrid, 1879, pp. 53–7, 97.

over literature was established on an impregnable basis. While as yet there was no definite outbreak of heresy Rome was growing more alarmed at the increasing independence of thought everywhere manifesting itself through the press, as the human intellect was throwing off the shackles of mediævalism and men were beginning to investigate where their fathers had been content to believe. Prudence demanded that some limit should be imposed on the spirit of inquiry which was daily becoming more recklessly audacious and was finding a rapidly growing audience through the medium of books. The fifth council of Lateran, assembled in Rome under Leo X., therefore adopted with but one dissenting voice a papal constitution laid before it which recited the injury to faith and morals and public peace arising from the increasing number of books containing doctrines contrary to religion and libellous attacks on individuals. Therefore forever thereafter no book should be printed without a preliminary examination and licence, to be gratuitously given, in Rome by the papal vicar and the master of the sacred palace, and elsewhere by the bishop and inquisitor, the bishop being authorized to act through a deputy of adequate learning. Violations of this provision were visited with excommunication, suspension from business, a fine of a hundred ducats applicable to the fabric of St. Peter's and forfeiture of the unlicensed books, which were to be publicly burnt; persistent offences were to be repressed by the bishops with all the severity of the canons.[1] The duties of censorship were thus shared between the bishops and the Inquisition; the former, as a rule, engrossed in temporal cares, were negligent, and there is no trace, at least in Spain at this period, of their discharging the functions thus imposed on them; the latter was active and aggressive, eager to extend its jurisdiction,

[1] Concil. Lateran. V. Sess. ix. (Harduin. IX. 1779). In the acts of the Council the suspension threatened from business is for a year, but no duration is specified in the decree as embodied in the Corpus Juris (Septimi Decretal. Lib. v. Tit. iv. c. 3).

and it formed the appropriate instrumentality through which Church and State could best curb the licentiousness of the press. Still, as we shall see, the preliminary licence here provided for eventually passed into the hands of the State, and the functions of the Inquisition became practically limited to passing judgment on errors which had escaped the vigilance of the official censors, and to enforcing the surrender of forbidden books, for which its effective organization gave it special fitness. Authors thus became subjected to a reduplicated censorship which guaranteed the faithful from contamination, at the expense, it must be allowed, of effectually checking the development of intellect.

THE REFORMATION.

The Church had taken its precautions none too soon. The ferment in men's minds was bound to lead to an explosion, though no one could foretell where it might burst forth or the character which it might assume. Luther came and Latin Christianity found itself involved in a death-struggle wherein the theocracy so patiently built up by the labor of centuries was threatened with destruction. Even distant Spain, where Church and State were more firmly united and more solidly organized than elsewhere, did not wholly escape the infection of the new ideas. Hitherto the heresy looked for in books had been almost wholly confined to hidden Judaism and Mahometanism or the superstitions of sorcery, and the efforts of the Inquisition had been directed to vindicating the faith from the errors of the New Christians—the unhappy Jews and Moriscos, forcibly converted by the thousand and secretly cherishing their ancestral religions. It soon had to confront this new danger. The German reformers, exuberant in the possession of unexpected liberty, confident in the belief that

the whole sacerdotal system would be speedily overthrown, were by no means content to carry on a defensive war at home, but were seeking allies everywhere and were attacking the enemy in his strongholds.

Rome soon became alive to the necessity of defending its territory at all points. A clause in the bull *Exsurge Domine*, in 1520, ordered the burning of all of Luther's books, even those not containing heresies, and the Universities of Louvain and Cologne had not waited for this, but had burned them in 1519.[1] This was followed in 1521, during the absence of Charles V. in Germany, by a brief of Leo X. addressed to the governors of Castile, calling upon them to prevent the introduction of Luther's books. Cardinal Adrian of Utrecht, who then was inquisitor general, made haste to obey, and on April 7 ordered all inquisitors to seize such works wherever they might be found. In 1523 he repeated the command and instructed the governor of Guipuscoa, where the danger of contraband trade across the frontier was greatest, to lend official assistance.[2] The precaution was by no means needless. In the correspondence of Martin de Salinas, agent of the Infante Ferdinand at the court of Charles V., a letter of June 25, 1524, mentions that a ship from Holland bound for Valencia had been captured by the French and then recaptured and brought into San Sebastian. On discharging her there were found two casks of Lutheran books, which were taken to the plaza and burnt, save some that had been carried off by individuals, the tracing and recovery of which caused no little trouble. Eight months later, on February 8, 1525, he writes that three Venetian galeasses had arrived at a port in the kingdom of Granada, bringing large quantities of Lutheran books. On learning the fact the corregidor seized and burnt the books and arrested the captains

[1] Mag. Bullar. Roman. I. 613.—D'Argentré, Collect. Judic. de novis Error. I. II. 358, 359.

[2] Llorente, Hist. critique, I. 457.

and crews, for whose release the Venetian ambassador was then interceding.[1] These chance allusions justify the belief that such attempts were constant, and when these were baffled there was still the risk that heretic doctrines might be smuggled into the kingdom under orthodox disguise. The Supreme Council of the Inquisition, August 11, 1530, urged the inquisitors to increased vigilance; it had been learned that Lutheran writings were introduced under false titles, or under the names of Catholic authors, or conveyed in notes to books of unquestioned orthodoxy; the inquisitors were ordered to examine minutely all public libraries and to add to the Edict of Denunciations, published annually, a clause requiring the denunciation of all who possessed such books or had read them.[2] These methods of propagandism continued for a long period and even were extended to the New World.[3] In 1558, Peter Veller, a bookseller of Antwerp, testified before the Inquisition of Flanders as to the extent of the trade in heretical books with Spain; money was sent thence to Germany to print such works and numerous expedients were devised for their transmission.[4] In 1568 the Inquisition of Barcelona reported that its commissioner at Perpignan had learned from a merchant that he had seen at Chartres a large quantity of Lutheran books in Spanish packed for shipment to Spain. At the same time the Spanish ambassador at Paris wrote that heretic books were forwarded thence in Burgundy and Champagne wine-casks; whereupon the Supreme Council ordered its officials in Guipuscoa, Navarre, Aragon and Catalonia to watch the frontier with the most vigilant care.[5]

[1] Menendez y Pelayo, Heterodoxos Españoles, II. 315–16.

[2] Llorente, I. 457. In 1532 one of the charges against Maria Cazalla, then on trial before the tribunal of Toledo, was that she knew of persons who possessed suspected books and had not denounced them to the Inquisition, thus rendering herself suspect of heresy (Melgares Marin, Procedimientos de la Inquisicion, II. 88).

[3] Jacobi Simancæ de Cathol. Institt. Tit. XXXVIII. No. 12, 13.

[4] Eduard Böhmer, Bibliotheca Wiffeniana, London, 1883, Vol. II. p. 64.

[5] Llorente, I. 477.

In spite of this we hear of the successful despatch of thirty thousand copies of a Spanish version of Calvin's Institutes.[1] In 1573 the Venetian agent at Madrid relates that the Huguenots had sent to the Spanish colonies men and books to corrupt not only the Indians but the half-breed Spaniards who were easily led astray, and on this account all commerce with the Indies had been prohibited to the Germans and even to the subjects of Philip II. in the Low Countries.[2]

It was, moreover, not only these assaults from enemies that had to be met or parried. The Reformation had altered the whole situation, not only outside, but inside the Church. The laxity which had been permissible during the long period of unquestioned domination was no longer in place, and the utterances of the orthodox were to be judged by very different standards from those hitherto in use. What had been, prior to the fateful nailing of Luther's theses to the church door of Wittenburg, in 1517, merely allowable criticism, to be laughed at for its impotence or endured because it could do no harm, became aid and comfort to the enemy who was breaching the walls and sapping the ramparts. Freedom and even licence of speech had been allowed, since the heresies of the thirteenth century had ceased to be dangerous; there had been plenty of reformers within the Church who had exhaled in safety their indignation at its corruptions in language as emphatic as that of Luther and Zwingli, and had been listened to by the hierarchy with the smile of amused contempt, but that time was past, never to return, and the Church, which was battling for existence with half of Europe threatening revolt, could only regard as treason what it had grown accustomed to tolerate with good-natured indifference.

The change thus wrought is manifested with special clearness in the case of Erasmus and his disciples, which is one of

[1] Böhmer, op. cit. II. 78.

[2] Relazioni Venete, Serie I. T. VI. p. 462.

the most symptomatic phenomena of the epoch. Erasmus, the sickly scholar of Rotterdam, the flatterer of popes and princes, the vainglorious boaster, the querulous grumbler when his assaults were retaliated in kind, is, when rightly considered, one of the most heroic figures in an age of heroes. Nowhere else can we find an instance so marked of the power of pure intellect. His gift of ridicule was the most dreaded weapon in Europe and he had used it mercilessly upon the most profitable abuses of the Church—relics and pilgrimages and indulgences. The immoral lives of the clergy, the ignorant fanaticism of the religious orders, and the sophistical subtleties of scholastic theology had been the subject of his most vigorous sarcasm; he had aroused the implacable hostility of the most powerful organizations in Europe, and he never, in the hour of the greatest danger, withdrew or retracted what he had written, beyond admitting that in the rashness of youth he had spoken unadvisedly.[1] The favor of the people who suffered from the exactions and licence which he so ruthlessly assailed, of the princes who recognized in him an ally against the encroachments of the Church, and of the

[1] See his letter to Cardinal Manrique, the inquisitor general, printed by Usóz y Rio (Reformistas Antiguos Españoles, Dos Informaziones, Append. p. 8). Writing to George Duke of Saxony in 1524 he says: "Mundus instupuerat ceremoniis, mali monachi regnabant impune qui laqueis inextricabilibus involverant hominum conscientias. Theologia ad quas tricas sophisticas reciderat? Jam definiendi temeritas in immensum processerat. Ne quid hic commemorem de episcopis aut sacerdotibus aut his qui nomine Romani pontificis exercebant tyrannidem."—D. Erasmi Roterod. Epistt. Lib. XXI. Ep. 7 (Ed. Londini, 1642).

In 1528, writing to a bishop, he alludes to two persons in France, threatened with death because, on account of illness, they had eaten flesh on two days in Lent, and he adds, "Vide quid faciunt ceremoniæ, nimirum ut ob hominum constitutiones violemus precepta Dei, levius ducentes parricidium quam præterire constitutiones Pontificum."—Lib. XXII. Ep. 30.

We need hardly be surprised that Nicholas of Egmond, the leading theologian of the University of Louvain, used to call him Antichrist, and to say that there was no difference between Luther and Erasmus except that Erasmus was the greater heretic.—Lib. XIX, Ep. 91. Cf. Lib. XXX, Ep. 13.

popes who feared to provoke his bitter mood, sustained him, and he felt no fear so long as the old order remained untouched. Then came Luther, who grappled with the dogmas lying at the roots of sacerdotalism, and Christendom was involved in a conflict where quarter was neither asked nor given. Erasmus clung to the old Church; although his scholarship had led him to question the divine origin and authority claimed for many human observances, he maintained his orthodoxy and in due time he was involved in ardent controversy with the Reformers. Yet to him was attributed the impulsion that had rendered the Reformation possible and he was hated equally by both sides.[1] Everywhere the theologians of the schools were engaged in drawing up lists of his errors, which were not difficult to find, and in proving him a Lutheran,[2] and he was incessantly busy in defending himself and in replying to their attacks. It was not merely his reputation that was at stake. His personal safety was involved, and he might well tremble at the thought of the thousands of doctors and priests and monks and friars who were more eager for his blood than for that of Luther.[3] Yet the solitary

[1] In 1519 Erasmus wrote to Frederic of Saxony skilfully pleading for Luther without committing himself to Luther's justification. Frederic's reply shows that this was not without influence in confirming his protection of Luther (Lutheri Opp. Jenæ, 1564, I. 211–12). Pallavicino in fact holds Erasmus responsible for the course of Frederic (Hist. Concil. Trident. Lib. I. c. xxiii. No. 7).

[2] He would have been condemned at Louvain but for the strenuous interference of Charles V. and Chancellor Gattinara (Caballero, Conquenses ilustres, IV. 321, 344). The Sorbonne, being under no such restraining influence, indulged itself, between 1525 and 1527, in repeated condemnations (D'Argentré, II. I. 41–47).

Florimond de Rémond (Synopsis Controversiarum, Lib. I. c. viii.) tells us that at the time there were sayings current in Germany: *Erasmus innuit, Lutherus irruit. Erasmus parit ova, Lutherus excludit pullas. Erasmus dubitat, Lutherus asseverat. Aut Erasmus Lutherizat, aut Lutherus Erasmizat.* Rémond, however, asserts his own belief in the orthodoxy of Erasmus.

[3] Maximilianus Transylvanus writes, Oct. 25, 1527, to Alonso de Valdés, secretary of Charles V., that in the Netherlands it is as dangerous to defend

scholar, his frail body racked with gout and stone and innumerable other ailments, stoutly maintained himself to the last against his merciless foes in both camps. Perhaps the most effective tribute to his power is that successive popes, whose authority he had done so much to undermine, dreaded him to that point that they not only courted him and made light of his aberrations, but defended him against his enemies. In 1515 and 1516 Leo X. wrote to him in the most flattering terms and stimulated him to prosecute the labors which were to bring him so much objurgation. In 1521, after the Lutheran revolt had broken out, Leo urged him to assail the impious heretics and promised him a hearty welcome if he would visit Rome.[1] In that same year the learned Spaniard, Diego Lopez de Stúñiga, assailed his translation of the New Testament and proved him to be an Arian, an Apollinarian, a Sabellian, and a Lutheran, who denied both the divinity and humanity of Christ and the sacramental quality of marriage.[2] Stúñiga had shown his first work to Cardinal Ximenes, who told him not to print it until he should have submitted it to Erasmus, when if the latter could not answer it, or answered it petulantly, he could print it; but as soon as Ximenes died Stúñiga hastened to publish it.[3] Leo X. interfered and imposed silence on Stúñiga, but the irrepressible

Erasmus as to defend Luther. Erasmus, he says, wishes to come to Brabant if he can be protected from the monks and theologians, and Valdés is asked to procure for him an imperial safe-conduct, so that the inquisitor general and the pope shall be his sole judges (Caballero, Conquenses ilustres, IV. 344–5).

The principal crime for which Louis de Berquier was burnt in Paris in 1529 was the translation of some of Erasmus's minor works (C. Schmidt, in Herzog's Real-Encyk. *s. v.*).

[1] Erasmi Epistt. Lib. I. Epp. 4, 5, 28.—Lämmer, Monumenta Vaticana, p. 3 (Friburgi, 1861).

[2] Menendez y Pelayo, II. 50–2. Yet this New Testament was dedicated to Leo X. and when a new edition was about to appear Leo wrote a formal brief commending his labors as most profitable to the faith, urging him to continue them, and assuring him that God would reward him and man bestow on him eternal fame (Erasmi Epistt. Lib. XXIX. Ep. 80).

[3] Erasmi Epistt. Lib. XV. Ep. 4.

Spaniard, who was in Rome, persisted in maintaining the controversy with tracts issued in the interregnums after the deaths of Leo and of Adrian VI., in spite of repeated prohibitions from the cardinals and from Adrian. Finally, if we may believe Erasmus, Clement VII. threatened him with incarceration if he would not cease his attacks; we know that Clement wrote twice to Erasmus saying that he had interposed to shield him from abuse, praising his Commentaries upon the Acts, and promising him a substantial gratification. Adrian, while yet inquisitor general of Spain, had dismissed as unworthy of attention a number of extracts from the works of Erasmus sent to him for condemnation by the theologians of Louvain.[1] This continued to the end. In the last year of Erasmus's life Paul III. wrote to him thanking him warmly for advice and asking his aid in guiding the Church through its troubles; Paul also offered him the provostship of Daventry, free of the usual fees, and, when this was refused, proposed to create him a cardinal.[2]

That this favor was unwillingly extorted by the dread of antagonizing a man of such unrivalled intellectual power was well known in the inner circles of the papal court, and was freely stated in 1531 by Aleander, the papal nuncio in Brussels, and subsequently Cardinal of Brindisi, in a letter to Sanga, the secretary of Clement VII.—"it is well known that but for fear of irritating him to do worse the Holy See would have condemned many of his writings, notwithstanding the favors shown by some of our highest prelates and those who play the saint in order to be lauded by him in an epistle"—and the shrewd nuncio prophesied that eventually he would be condemned by the Church.[3] The prophecy was

[1] Erasmi Epistt. Lib. XVII. Ep. 13; Lib. XIX. Epp. 1, 91; Lib. XX. Epp. 39, 40, 46; Lib. XXI. Epp. 9, 11; Lib. XXX. Epp. 1, 36.—Balan, Monumenta Sæculi XVI. pp. 10, 12 (Œnoponte, 1885).

[2] Erasmi Epistt. Lib. XXVII. Epp. 25, 26, 28, 40, 54; Lib. XXX. Ep. 70.

[3] Lämmer, Monumenta Vaticana, p. 94. Cf. Pallavicini Hist. Conc. Trident. Lib. I. c. xxiii. No. 10.

fulfilled. When the lion was dead, Paul IV., in his *Index Librorum Prohibitorum*, of 1559, condemned him with a spiteful vigor vouchsafed to no other author; all his writings were forbidden whether they treated on religious subjects or not.[1] His very name was to be obliterated from human memory. Benito Árias Montano informs us that the commission appointed by the Council of Trent for the framing of an Index held five or more meetings a week for two years, during which Erasmus furnished the largest subject of discussion.[2] The result was that he was removed from the authors of the first class, of whom all the writings were prohibited; some of his works were condemned and the rest were allowed when expurgated. Yet the question would not settle itself. In 1590 Sixtus V. replaced him in the first class. In 1596 Clement VIII. restored the Tridentine classification, and this has been preserved in subsequent Indexes with little alteration.[3] Notwithstanding this comparative lenity the abhor-

[1] The entry reads "Desiderius Erasmus Roterodamus cum universis commentariis, annotationibus, scholiis, dialogis, epistolis, censuris, versionibus, libris et scriptis suis, etiam si penitus nil contra religionem vel de religione contineant" (Reusch, Die Indices Librorum Prohibitorum, p. 183, Tübingen, 1886).

Yet as late as 1549 the Colloquies, perhaps the most offensive of all his writings, were still largely used as a text-book in the Latin course of many orthodox schools. In the Council of Cologne, held in that year, Archbishop Adolf protested against the continuance of this (Hartzheim, Concil. German. VI. 537). Already in 1538 the "*Consilium de Emendanda Ecclesia*" drawn up by order of Paul III. had pointed out that the use of the Colloquies in schools trained youth to impiety and that it should be prohibited (Le Plat, Monumentt. ad Hist. Concil. Trident. II. 602).

[2] Villanueva, De la Leccion de la Sagrada Escritura, pp. 29–30.

[3] Reusch, Die Indices, pp. 257, 477.—Index Clement. VIII., Romæ, 1596, pp. 43, 44, 46.—Elenchus Librorum Omnium, Romæ, 1632, p. 157.—Index Benedicti XIV., Romæ, 1758, p. 93.—Index Leonis XIII., Romæ, 1887, p. 109.

Yet in Brisighelli's *Index Expurgatorius* he is treated as a condemned author and references to him in other writers are expunged, "ob nomen et testimonium Erasmi auctoris damnati" (Index Libb. Expurgandd. Jo. Mariæ Brasichellensis, Bergomæ, 1608, T. I. p. 463).

rence which long continued to be felt for him in the Roman court is shown by the efforts of Raynaldus to prove him not only the worst of heretics, but an atheist.[1]

THE SPANISH ERASMISTS.

Among the cultured Spaniards assembled at the court of Charles V. Erasmus was the fashion. The young emperor himself was known to regard him with favor; the chancellor, Mercurio Gattinara, was his correspondent and was ever ready to protect him, and the imperial secretary, Alfonso de Valdés was his enthusiastic admirer. He was equally strong with the highest dignitaries of the Church. The dreaded inquisitor general, Cardinal Alfonso Manrique, Archbishop of Seville, declared Erasmus to be another Jerome and Augustin. The primate of Spain, Alfonso Fonseca, Archbishop of Toledo, was also an Erasmist, and when trouble came wrote to him with assurances of his protection and of that of the emperor and of all good men. On the same side were the two Vergaras—Juan, secretary to Fonseca and one of the foremost Spanish men of letters, and his brother Francisco, for ten years professor of Greek at Alcalá and the leading Hellenist of his time. The secretary of Manrique, Luis Nuñez Coronel, was a zealous Erasmist, as also was the Dominican, Francisco de Vitoria, chief professor at Salamanca, and the whole faculty of Alcalá with the exception of Pedro Ciruelo. Luis Vives, then already rising to eminence, was another earnest admirer, as also were Fray Alfonso de Virués, a Benedictine preacher of high repute and subsequently Bishop of the Canaries, and Juan de Maldonado vicar general of the Archbishop of Búrgos. Such opposition as had manifested itself seemed to

[1] Raynaldi Annal. ann. 1516, No. 89–100.

disappear. The unconquerable Diego Lopez de Stúñiga died; Sancho Carranza, brother of Bartolomé the subsequent Archbishop of Toledo, who had joined in the attack, was reconciled to Erasmus and became his warm defender. All Spanish culture united in praising the Dutch scholar. His Colloquies were used as a school-book and his Praise of Folly was in the hands of all humanists. As late as March, 1527, Alfonso de Valdés wrote to him that his books were everywhere in Spain and that no merchandise there was more saleable.[1]

Trouble began with the translation into Castilian, in 1527, of his *Enchiridion Militis Christiani*, or *Manual of the Christian Soldier*, a little work, written in 1502, and approved at the time by Adrian VI., then at the head of the University of Louvain. When the translation was proposed it was objected to by a Dominican friar who alleged against it passages in which the existence of purgatory seemed to be questioned and monachism was not considered as identical with piety, but Luis Nuñez Coronel replied vigorously to the objector, and the work went on.[2] The translator was Alfonso Fernandez de Madrid, Archdeacon of Alcor; he softened some of the expressions that might give umbrage; he added a prologue defending the translation into the vernacular of the New Testament, and dedicated the volume to Cardinal Manrique, the inquisitor general. The latter had the book duly examined and authorized its publication.[3] Appearing under patronage so exalted it had an immense success and soon

[1] Menendez y Pelayo, II. 47, 63–4, 73, 75, 727–8.—Erasmi Epistt. Lib. XVIII. Ep. 1; XXI. Ep. 24.—Caballero, Conquenses ilustres, IV. 324.

Stúñiga, when dying in Naples, asked his executors not to print the material which he had collected against the fourth edition of Erasmus's New Testament, but to send it to Erasmus in order that he might profit by it. Stúñiga's friend Sepúlveda gives him the highest character, not only for learning but for courtesy and candor (Sepulvedæ Opera, Colon. Agripp. 1602, p. 612).

[2] Erasmi Epistt. Lib. XIX. Ep. 91.

[3] Menendez y Pelayo, II. 66.

was in the hands of everyone, but the patronage could not save it from attack. In fact, seeing how much there is in it destructive of the received observances of the Church one must wonder rather at the liberality which permitted than at the obscurantism which deprecated the circulation of such a work among the people in the vulgar tongue. The monks and friars who had suffered so severely from the caustic spirit of Erasmus saw the opportunity for revenge and were not tardy in taking advantage of it. As early as May 17, 1527, Erasmus writes to a correspondent about the tremendous tumult which it had excited among the monks; and on September 27 the translator appealed to Coronel, describing how at Palencia a Franciscan, Juan de San Vicente, had from the pulpit denounced the book as containing a thousand heresies, how he had vanquished the *fraile* in a public disputation thereon, and asking that Manrique punish or at least force to a recantation the audacious man who had dared to assail a work published with the archbishop's approbation.[1]

When it was proposed to translate the Colloquies and the "Lingua" Erasmus might well deprecate the inopportune zeal of his disciples and suggest that it would be safer to undertake some of his devotional works.[2] The opposition to him, in fact, was rapidly gathering head, and ammunition for it was furnished by the English ambassador in Spain, Dr. Edward Lee, subsequently Wolsey's successor in the see of York. He was a distinguished theologian and had previously without success endeavored to procure at Louvain the condemnation of Erasmus. Now he saw his opportunity and drew up a treatise in which he accused Erasmus of numerous heresies, including disbelief in the Trinity, in the divinity of

[1] Erasmi Epistt. Lib. XIX. Ep. 13.—Menendez y Pelayo, II. 67-8.

In the elaborate expurgation of the works of Erasmus in the 1640 Index of Sotomayor (Ed. Genevæ, 1667, p. 284) the *Enchiridion* escapes with only four passages to be *borrados* or expunged.

[2] Erasmi Epistt. Lib. XIX. Ep. 53.

Christ and in the existence of the Holy Ghost.[1] This was circulated among the friars and Erasmus was apprehensive that it would be printed, but Chancellor Gattinara reassured him with the information that nothing was permitted to be published in Spain without a careful previous examination. This censorship, he said, was rigidly exercised, so that everybody could not print his reveries, and he fervently wished that an equally salutary rule could be enforced in Germany[2] —had it been, the whole course of the Reformation might have been changed. Gattinara's remark is important as proving the existence of an organized preliminary censorship at the date of the letter, February 20, 1527, though we are ignorant as to its practical details. As yet the printing of a licence in front of a book was not required, and there is nothing to show whether this preliminary censorship was exercised by the bishops under the ordinance of 1502, or by the Inquisition under the Lateran decree. It was probably the former; the translation of the *Enchiridion* seems to have been licensed by Manrique in his capacity as Archbishop of Seville; and Juan de Valdés, in his contemporary *Diálogo de Mercurio y Caron* represents his ideal bishop as making a strict examination of all the books in his diocese; those which he found injurious through falsehood, immorality, or superstition he confiscated, and he would allow nothing to be read save what he himself caused to be printed.[3] Even reformers could not comprehend as yet that freedom of thought and expression was possible in a well-ordered state.

It was comforting to Erasmus to learn that he was to be thus protected, but the favor of the Inquisitor General Manrique was even more important. The religious orders and especially the Mendicants rose in a concerted assault.[4] It

[1] Erasmi Epistt. Lib. XIX. Ep. 71; Lib. XXII. Ep. 19.

[2] Erasmi Epistt. Lib. XXVII. Ep. 33.

[3] Dos Diálogos (Reformistas antiguos Españoles, pp. 258–61).

[4] Juan de Vergara tells us that the Orders which depended for subsistence on popular liberality, such as the Dominicans, Franciscans, Carmelites and

was in vain that the dreaded Inquisition repeatedly commanded them to be silent. Denunciations of heresy poured in against him, the pulpits resounded with abuse of him, the confessional was used effectively to prevent the reading of his obnoxious books, and an unofficial but active censorship was established to prevent their sale. Monachism was a power in the Church which few could venture to resist; in ordinary questions it was to a great extent neutralized by the bitter antagonism which raged between the Orders, but here they were united and their combined influence was a force with which the Inquisition was obliged to temporize. In March, 1527, Manrique held repeated sessions of the Supreme Council to consider the matter. Many prominent *frailes* were summoned before it and sharply reproved for exciting the people against Erasmus in defiance of successive edicts; they were ordered to be silent and were told that judgment on his writings did not belong to them; if they believed that there were errors they must submit them to the Inquisition. The *frailes* defended themselves by asserting that Erasmus was secretly coöperating with Luther; his books should be all called in and examined for heresy as had already been done by the Sorbonne. The Council replied that the papal favor was evidence that the books were orthodox; if the accusers desired to point out errors appropriate action would be taken, but meanwhile the attacks must cease. Thus challenged, the *frailes* parcelled out the work of systematically examining the books for errors, and with the assistance of Edward Lee a formidable list of twenty-one articles was framed by March 28.[1]

Trinitarians, were especially bitter. Those which had foundations for their support, as the Benedictines, Bernardines, Cistercians and Jeronimites, were less unanimous (Menendez y Pelayo, II. 725). There were, however, honorable exceptions in all the Orders.

[1] This list of errors is interesting as showing how readily the real causes of provocation could be concealed under a show of zeal for the purity of the faith, though some of them were justified by the mocking tone in which

The Supreme Council of the Inquisition assembled to receive the articles with Archbishop Manrique at its head, assisted by two imperial privy councillors. Erasmus was assailed by a Dominican, a Franciscan, and a Trinitarian, and was defended by a Benedictine and a Trinitarian. The discussion was bitter until Manrique put an end to it and referred the whole matter to an assembly of twenty theologians and nine friars, with orders to report by May 30. These disputed for a month over the first two articles and then took up the third. The debate promised to be endless and Manrique suspended it, leaving the matter undecided. The decision

Erasmus had derided popular superstitions before the Lutheran revolt. As printed by Menendez y Pelayo (II. 78) they are:

1. The Arian heresy of denying the consubstantiality of the Word.
2. The Arian heresy of denying the divinity of the Son.
3. Affirming that the Holy Ghost is not qualified as God in Scripture and the Fathers.
4. Thinking ill of the Inquisition and disapproving the temporal punishment of heretics.
5. Denying the efficacy of baptism.
6. Asserting the modern origin of the confessional.
7. Errors as to the Eucharist.
8. Attributing sacerdotal authority to the people and denying the primacy of the pope.
9. Defending divorce.
10. Attacking the authority of Scripture by accusing the apostles of ignorance and forgetfulness.
11. Ridiculing the points at issue between Catholics and Lutherans as mere scholastic questions.
12. Speaking disrespectfully of the Fathers and especially of St. Jerome.
13. Much irreverence as to the cult of the Virgin.
14. Diminishing the authority of the pope and of general councils.
15. Censuring as Judaism church ceremonies, fasts, etc.
16. Preferring matrimony to virginity.
17. Condemning absolutely scholastic theology.
18. Holding as useless indulgences, veneration of saints, pilgrimages, and relics.
19. Casting doubt over the right of the Church to temporal possessions.
20. Doubts as to free will.
21. Doubts as to the pains of hell.

had been awaited with the utmost interest by the learned throughout Europe, especially in the Netherlands, and Erasmus was left in a condition of anxious suspense.[1] To relieve him Alfonso de Valdés persuaded Gattinara to procure from Charles V. a letter to Clement VII., then his prisoner, asking for a brief in favor of Erasmus. Juan Perez was sent to Rome with the imperial missive and obtained from Clement a brief of August 1, 1527, addressed to Manrique, imposing silence on all who should attack the writings of Erasmus in so far as they concerned Luther. Manrique went further than this and issued an absolute prohibition to write against Erasmus, and so long as he lived the opponents of the scholar were silenced. Only two Spaniards ventured to disobey the command; one of these printed his book secretly, the other wrote in Italy.[2]

[1] We have various accounts of this controversy sent to Erasmus by his friends. One is from Luis Vives, July, 1527 (Auctar. Epistt. ex Ludov. Vive, Londini, 1642, p. 109). Another is from Alfonso de Valdés, Aug. 1 (Caballero, Conquenses ilustres, IV. 335). The most authoritative is from Juan de Vergara, whose position as secretary to the Inquisitor General Manrique renders his account almost official (Menendez y Pelayo, II. 720). See also Sandoval, Historia de Carlos V. Lib. XVI. § xiv.

Vergara illustrates the terror inspired among the friars by the name of Erasmus, with a story that a prelate of high reputation was conducting divine service when the congregation was disturbed by an unseemly contest for precedence between two bodies of monks. He exclaimed, "Be quiet! May that wicked Erasmus catch you!" and the tumult ceased at once (Menendez y Pelayo, II. 726). The good padres had no hesitation in circulating the most outrageous falsehoods about the whole affair. Vicente Navarro, in a letter from Barcelona, Oct. 25, 1528, relates that the friar of the Jeronimite convent of La Murta gravely told him that Erasmus had been condemned by a great council held at Búrgos and that the wicked Lutheran would have been burnt by the holy fathers had he not managed to escape by flight (Caballero, IV. 396).

[2] Menendez y Pelayo, II. 81–3. One of these was Luis de Carvajal, a man of eminent piety and culture, then in Paris. Curiously enough, one of his tracts in the controversy which ensued, the *Dulcoratio amarulentiarum Erasmiæ responsionis*, was put on the Spanish Index of 1559 (Reusch, Die Indices, p. 221) and on the Roman Index of 1596, "nisi prius repurgetur" (Index Clement. VIII. p. 73).

The other was the learned Juan Gines de Sepúlveda, who took up the

Charles V. left Spain in 1529, carrying with him Gattinara and Alfonso de Valdés. The Inquisitor General Manrique fell into disgrace with the Empress-regent Isabella, and was relegated to his diocese of Seville in August 1529, where he remained until Charles's return in 1533.[1] In 1534 Archbishop Fonseca of Toledo died, depriving the Erasmists of one of their most efficient protectors. The Erasmists were persecuted, though, curiously enough, as we shall see hereafter, it was mostly under the convenient charge of Illuminism, the only link between which and Erasmism was the common disregard of external ceremonies. Fonseca's secretary, Juan de Vergara, was arrested and lay long a prisoner of the Inquisition. Another of the Vergara brothers, Bernardino de Tovar, was likewise seized, as well as Alonso de Virués and other learned men.[2] Erasmus himself passed away in 1536, and Manrique followed him in 1538. The fear inspired by the pen of the great writer was removed as well as the men who had power to defend him. The struggle with the Reformers was growing bitterer and deadlier than ever, and there was no one to palliate the exuberance of him who had done so much to render the Reformation possible. That his works should be condemned was inevitable, but the process was gradual. In 1535 Charles V. made it a capital offence to use his Colloquies in schools, and in 1538 he prohibited the Moria, the Epistles, the Paraphrases of the Gospels, and even the Refutation of Luther.[3] Yet in the first Spanish Index (1551) only the Colloquia and its Epitome and the Ecclesi-

cudgels in defence of his deceased friend, Alberto Pio, Prince of Carpi, who had assailed Erasmus in a folio volume published in Venice in 1531 (Sepúlvedæ Antapologia, Opp. Colon. Agripp. 1602, p. 596). Carpi's work was translated into Spanish and it too was placed on the Spanish Index of 1551 (Reusch, p. 74).

[1] Zuñiga, Annales de Sevilla, Lib. XIV. año 1529.

[2] Auctar. Epistt. ex Ludov. Vive, Ep. 22, p. 114.—Mémoires d'Enzinas, ch. CLXXIX. (Bruxelles, 1863, II. 155).—Llorente, III. 11.

[3] Sandoval, Historia de la Vida de Carlos V., P. II. p. 808 (Barcelona, 1625). Possibly these edicts may have been intended only for his Netherland dominions.

astes are included.[1] The success of the translation of the Enchiridion had led to numerous versions of others of his books. These were overlooked in the Index of 1551, but were included by name in that of 1559, while in that of 1583 a general prohibition was uttered against them all.[2] As for the Latin originals, a long list was given in the Index of 1559, and a still longer one in that of 1583, while all relating to religion were ordered to be expurgated.[3] With an author so voluminous and so independent this business of expurgation was no easy task. In the Expurgatorial Index of 1584 Erasmus occupies no less than fifty-five quarto pages,[4] and by 1640 the minute care exercised in scrutinizing his works had swelled the list of errors to fifty-nine double-columned folio pages.[5] By this time he had come to be classed with incorrigible heretics. After his name on all title-pages the words "auctoris damnati" were ordered to be inserted; and in the preliminary edict the Inquisitor General, Antonio de Sotomayor, describes the garbling and corruption of texts practised by the heretics, among whom "Œcolampadius, Luther, and Erasmus are the most audacious. . . . The latter denies to St. Cyprian many of his writings, to St. Jerome nearly the half of his works, to St. Augustin more than seventy books, condemning them all rashly and blasphemously." The Scriptures, he adds, are especially corrupted by those who declare that new translations are necessary, "such as have been put forth by those sacrilegious blasphemers Pellican, Zwingli, Luther, Munster, Erasmus, Castalius, and others."[6] This was the final judgment of the

[1] Reusch, Die Indices, p. 74.

[2] Reusch, Die Indices, pp. 232, 233, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 434.

[3] Reusch, Die Indices, pp. 221, 403.

[4] Index Expurg. 1584, Ed. Saumuri, 1611, fol. 67–93. Nearly a third of the Antwerp *Index Expurgatorius* compiled under Árias Montano in 1571 is occupied with Erasmus.

[5] Index Expurg. 1640, pp. 256–315.

[6] Ibid. p. ii. Yet Erasmus's version of the New Testament was permitted (Ibid. Regla IV.), and in the body of the Index, although the emendations

Spanish Inquisition on Erasmus and it remained unaltered in the successive Indexes of 1707, 1747, and 1790.[1]

THE SCRIPTURES.

If Erasmus thus experienced the vicissitudes of fortune in the altered temper of the times caused by the Reformation, the treatment accorded to the Bible shows an equally instructive change. We have seen how freely vernacular versions were permitted in Spain after the scare caused by the heresies of the thirteenth century passed away, and that up to the close of the fifteenth there was no obstacle to printing them. Whether Ferdinand and Isabella prohibited translations of the Bible has been a disputed question. At the Council of Trent Cardinal Pacheco stated that they had done so with the approval of Paul II.,[2] but as Paul died in 1471 and Isabella did not succeed to the throne till 1474, the assertion was evidently a random one, deserving of no weight. Alfonso de Castro, writing in 1547, while arguing against the popular use of Scripture, says that Ferdinand and Isabella prohibited, under very heavy penalties, its translation or the possession of translations, but he gives no reason for such a law having fallen into desuetude.[3] The *Repertorium Inquisitionis*, printed at Valencia in 1494, says that it is forbidden to translate the Scriptures into the vulgar tongue,[4] but it bases this exclusively

ordered for his Commentary are numerous, only seven are enumerated for the text. One of these is designed to neutralize the approving brief of Leo X. over which is to be inscribed "Dulcibus encomiis pius Pater nutantem ovem allicere conatur" (Ib. p. 288). Inquisitorial censorship had grown so into the habit of treating the learned like children that it naturally adopted the most childish methods.

[1] Índice Último, Madrid, 1790, pp. iii.–iv.

[2] Pallavicini Hist. C. Trident. Lib. VI. c. xii. No. 5.

[3] Alphonsus a Castro adv. Hæreses Lib. I. c. xx. (Ed. Paris, 1571, p. 80).

[4] Repertorium Inquisitionis, s.v. *Scriptura*.

on the prohibition of Innocent III. to the Waldenses of Metz in 1199, which had been carried into the Corpus Juris and was familiar in that shape to jurists;[1] evidently the much more pertinent Aragonese law of 1234 had been completely forgotten. Had there been a recent edict with defined penalties the author could not have failed to refer to it, and this is strengthened by the fact that no such law is to be found in the compilations of legislation, such as Hugo de Celso's *Reportorio* (Alcalá, 1540), and the *Recopilaciones*, in which it would infallibly have been preserved.

The learned Bartolomé Carranza, Archbishop of Toledo, writing in 1557, says that for more than twenty years there had been in Spain an active debate on the subject. Before Luther's heresies emerged from hell he knew of no prohibition of the Bible in the vulgar tongue. In Spain he tells us there were versions current with the approbation of the sovereigns, but after the expulsion and forced conversion of the Jews it was found that the *conversos* secretly taught the Mosaic rites to their children by means of translations of the Bible which they subsequently printed at Ferrara, for which reason vernacular versions were forbidden to those who were not free from all suspicion.[2] This has an air of probability, especially in view of the hostility of Cardinal Ximenes to all versions of Scripture. His lofty contempt for the populace led him to anticipate for the Church unnumbered evils from the general dissemination of the Bible, and this he carried so far that when the good Hernando de Talavera, Archbishop of Granada, at the request of his Morisco converts, authorized the translating into Arabic and the printing of the texts used at matins and in the mass, Ximenes interfered and stopped the work.[3]

[1] Lib. IV. Extra vii. 12.—Innocent. PP. III. Regest. II. 141, 142, 235.

[2] Carranza, Comentarios sobre el Catechismo, Prólogo al Lector. I owe the opportunity of consulting this rare volume to the courtesy of the custodians of the noble White Historical Library at Cornell University.

[3] Gomez de Rebus Gestis Fran. Ximenii, Lib. II. fol. 32–33.

As Lutheranism aroused the Church to a sense of impending danger the Bible was rightly regarded as the source of the threatening heresies, and an effort was made to revive the ancient prohibitions which had everywhere grown obsolete. In December, 1527, the Sorbonne condemned as errors the expressions of Erasmus urging everyone to read the Scriptures in the vernacular, and it argued in favor of the papal condemnations.[1] Spain as yet was free from similar troubles and it is significant that this finds no place in the list of Erasmus's errors collected there almost simultaneously (p. 40), and that the Archdeacon of Alcor, in his prologue to the Enchiridion, argued warmly in favor of vernacular versions. Many such, indeed, must have been current. Maria Cazalla, when on trial by the Inquisition for Illuminism, in 1533, speaks of its being customary for Catholic women to read portions of Scripture in Castilian,[2] and Carranza in his *Comentarios* complains of the number of female expounders of Scripture who abounded everywhere as an evil to be suppressed.[3] In 1547 Alfonso de Castro shows that there could as yet have been no authoritative measures taken to prevent the circulation of vernacular Bibles, for in justification of his argument against it he is reduced to alleging some decrees of the Sorbonne, adding that many people laugh at them with the remark that Paris articles do not cross the mountains. He shows, moreover, by his long and earnest reasoning that zealous Spaniards were becoming keenly alive to the necessity of excluding the Scriptures if heresy was to be excluded. From their misinterpretation, he says, spring all heresies; as the keenest intellect and widest learning are required for their

[1] D'Argentré, II. I. 61.

[2] Melgares Marin, Procedimientos de la Inquisicion, II. 110. "Pero si por leer una epistola en romance se hubiese de imputar á delito ó se hubiese de tomar como predicacion pocas mujeres habría devotas ó que supieran leer, que no fuesen notadas de esto, que no es herejía ni delito de ninguna clase" (Ib. p. 114).

[3] Comentarios, Prólogo al Lector.

interpretation they must be sedulously kept from the people, and reverence for them will be destroyed if they are allowed to become common.[1] Another theologian of the day treats the reading of Scripture as an evil in itself, and ascribes to Satan the eagerness of the people for vernacular versions.[2]

These arguments met a speedy response. In 1546, probably while Alfonso de Castro was engaged on his work, the Council of Trent adopted, after a prolonged and bitter discussion, a decree in which the character of inspiration was virtually attributed to the Vulgate by pronouncing it authentic and not to be rejected or corrected under any pretence. The abuse made of Scripture was deplored as well as the habit of printers, without licence from the ecclesiastical authorities, of printing the books of Holy Writ, often with commentaries and annotations, without an imprint or author's name or with fictitious ones. In future no books on sacred subjects were to be printed, sold, or possessed until after episcopal examination and approval, under the penalties of the Lateran decree of 1515.[3] Vernacular versions were not specifically forbidden,

[1] Alphonsi de Castro adv. Hæreses Lib. I. c. xiii. (p. 81); Ejusd. de Justa Hæreticor. Punit. Lib. III. c. vi. vii. (pp. 1478 *sqq.*).

[2] Villanueva, De la Leccion de la Sagrada Escritura, p. 59.

[3] Concil. Trident. Sess. IV.—Sarpi, Istoria del Concil. Trident. Lib. II. (Ed. Helmstat, I. 144).—Pallavicino, Lib. VI. cap. xvii.—Theiner, Acta Genuina Conc. Trident., Zagrabiæ, 1874, T. I. pp. 79, 88.

Pallavicino argues that God of course provided his Church with a version free from all error, but he discreetly suppresses the fact that at the time of the Council this inspired and immaculate version was notoriously corrupt, as was subsequently admitted by the Clementine revision. The terror which the conciliar decree inspired among biblical scholars is shown in the proceedings of the inquisitorial trial of Luis de Leon. See Reusch, Luis de Leon und die Spanische Inquisition, Bonn, 1873, pp. 72 sqq., 104.

Rome was not strictly consistent in the prohibition of the vernacular Bible, but could encourage its circulation when that seemed to be the better policy. The Congregation *de Propaganda Fide* caused Arabic translations to be made for use in the East. When Socinianism spread in Poland through the versions of Nicholas Radzevil, Simon of Budni and Martin Ezechowski, the evil was met with the authoritative one of the Jesuit Jacob Vieki, printed in Cracow in 1599 with the approbation of Clement VIII. When the heresy spread to

but their production and use were effectually interfered with. It is true that Charles V. made light of this when, to meet the clamor for reform in Germany, he caused the adoption of the Interim and accompanied it with a Formula of Reformation in which, after forbidding immoral and heretical works, he ordered that the people should read the holy books, the fathers, the lives of the saints, and histories of brave and distinguished men.[1]

In Spain the conciliar decree met with better success. The business of condemning and seizing books was rapidly concentrating in the hands of the Inquisition. Under the imperial authority the University of Louvain in 1546 had issued a rudimentary index of forbidden books and had followed it with others. That of 1551, by order of Charles V., was reissued in Spain the same year by the Inquisitor General Valdés, together with a "Catalogue of books already condemned by the holy office of the Inquisition," showing that it had been busy in the good work. Among these is the significant entry of "Bibles translated into Spanish or other vulgar tongue."[2] Yet Archbishop Carranza tells us, in 1557, that he frequently permitted the use of vernacular Scriptures to both men and women whom he deemed worthy and that they derived from the perusal the utmost benefit, both moral

Hungary, Gregory Kaldius made a Majjar version, printed in Vienna, 1626, with the approbation of Urban VIII. (Villanueva, *op. cit.* pp. 50–1).

[1] Formula Reformat. cap. xix. § 4 (Goldast. Constt. Impp. II. 337). Ten years later the University of Louvain, in writing to Philip III., said that if this formula of reform could be enforced it would remove innumerable scandals (Le Plat, Monument. C. Trident. IV. 609, 612).

Sandoval, *Historia de la Vida de Carlos V.*, P. II. (Ed. Barcelona 1625, p. 808), alludes to an edict of Charles, May 24, 1550, forbidding the translation of the Bible or of any portion of it into the vernacular or into French, and the purchase or use of such versions, but this I presume applied only to his Flemish dominions, in which he was residing at the time. There is no trace in Spain of such legislation and Carranza could not have failed to allude to it.

[2] Reusch, Die Indices, pp. 27, 44, 73, 74.

and spiritual.[1] This shows at least that such versions were still readily procurable, and the same is to be inferred from Luis de Granada who prescribes reading the Gospel as a proper preparation for mental prayer.[2] Even twenty years later a story told of Santa Teresa shows that the orders of the Inquisition had been slackly obeyed. After she had founded in Toledo a convent of her rigid Order of Barefooted Carmelites, a young lady of that city applied for admission. Teresa approved of her and all details were settled as to dower, etc., when, the evening before she was to enter, on parting with Teresa, she said, "Mother, shall I bring my Bible?" "Bible, daughter," exclaimed the saint, "don't come here. We are ignorant women who only seek to do as we are ordered and we want neither you nor your Bible!" Her wisdom was justified by the event, for the young woman joined some foolish *beatas* who, instigated by the devil, endeavored to found a religious order without permission, and they were all penanced by the Inquisition in the *auto de fé* of 1579.[3]

But it was by no means only the vernacular versions which troubled the Church, nor had the Council of Trent acted without purpose in establishing the Vulgate as the standard of orthodoxy. The reformers had not restricted their energies to spreading the Scriptures before the people in their native dialects, but had been even more busy in preparing editions

[1] Comentarios, Prólogo al Lector. Melchor Cano did not fail to enumerate this among the errors of Carranza (Caballero, Vida de Melchor Cano, pp. 537, 539).

[2] Luis de Granada, Dell' Oratione et Meditatione, cap. iv. (Vinegia, 1561).

[3] Carta de Fray Diego de Yepes (Escritos de Santa Teresa, Madrid, 1882, T. I. p. 568).

Yet Santa Teresa's spiritual director, Jerónimo Gracian, in a work intended for the public, includes the Bible among the good books of which he urges the reading (Itinerario de la Perfeccion, cap. iii.).

A Jesuit mystic, Luis de Puente, also urges in the strongest terms the habitual reading of Scripture and especially of the Gospels (Guida Spirituale, tradotta dal Abate Sperelli, Roma, 1628, P. I. Trat. ii. Cap. 2).

for the learned, with new Latin versions and notes and commentaries adapted to their own systems of exegesis. This was introducing heresy in a more insidious form and it rendered necessary a more elaborate watchfulness. In September 1551 Valdés issued an edict directed especially against imported heretical Bibles, which the inquisitors were ordered to seize and to use rigorous measures against all recalcitrants.[1] The copies thus condemned were numerous, and loud complaints arose from their owners, who objected to the sacrifice. To palliate the evil, in 1554, Valdés issued a special expurgatorial Index in which fifty-four editions were examined and lists of the objectionable passages were made out, the texts being correct but the side-notes and comments heretical. All the owners of these Bibles were required to present them within sixty days to the inquisitors, when the objectionable passages would be obliterated, a notarial act be taken and a certificate be inserted in the copy. After the expiration of the term no further expurgation would be made and the possessor of an unexpurgated copy incurred the major excommunication, *latæ sententiæ*, a fine of thirty ducats, and a prosecution for suspicion of heresy. The same penalties were threatened against booksellers thereafter importing copies, for all importation, even of expurgated Bibles, was prohibited.[2] The mere desire to read the Bible thus became a symptom of heresy. In 1564 Don Gaspar de Centellas was on trial for Lutheranism in Valencia and Doctor Sigismundo Arques in Toledo. Among the papers of the former was found a long letter from the latter containing a passage advising him to read two chapters daily of the Old Testament and two of the New. This phrase is underscored as a proof of their guilt by the inquisitor, who points out in a side-note

[1] Llorente, I. 465.

[2] Reusch, Der Index der verbotenen Bücher, I. 200–1.—Menendez y Pelayo, II. 700.

In the Index of Quiroga, 1583, the list of prohibited Bibles in Latin and Greek had grown to eighty-nine (Reusch, Die Indices, pp. 390–4).

that this is Lutheran doctrine.[1] The sensitiveness thus developed with regard to the Scriptures is appropriately illustrated by the vicissitudes endured by the Bible of Vatable, the notes of which were reported to have been hereticized by the printer, Robert Estienne.[2] Its expurgation was undertaken at Salamanca, the stronghold of orthodoxy, and the edition appeared in 1555, but notwithstanding the careful scrutiny bestowed upon it the susceptibilities of the Inquisition were aroused, and it was forbidden in the Index of 1559. Then in 1569 a further expurgation was undertaken under the auspices of the Inquisition itself, by the theologians of Salamanca, leading to squabbles between them which culminated in the incarceration by the Holy Office of three of them—Luis de Leon, Gaspar de Grajal and Martín Martínez. The royal licence to print the work is dated in 1573, but the printing was not completed till 1584, a delay arising from the interference of the Inquisition, which ruined Portonares, the distinguished printer.[3] Still it was not allowed to appear until

[1] "Alude a los de los luteranos que se cieran con el nuebo y viejo testamento sin azer caso de la expusicion y lo cerca de ellos recebido por la yglesia" (MSS. of the Königl. Universitäts Bibliothek of Halle, Yc. 20, T. XI.).

In the same way an allusion to the purchase of a Greek Testament is noted as showing that he does not care for the version received by the Church.

[2] Vatable himself was of undoubted orthodoxy.—"Erat autem Vatablus Catholicæ religionis studiosissimus" (Florimundi Ræmundi Synopsis Controversiarum Lib. VIII. c. xvi. No. 3).

[3] The establishment of Andres de Portonares was an old and renowned one. In his vainglorious address to the reader, prefixed to his edition of Melchor Cano's Lectures on the Sacrament of Penitence, Salamanca, 1550, he says: "quam aliquot jam annis per universam hanc Hispaniæ regionem a te celebrata, sparsa, ac disseminata fuerit nominis mei fama." No better work than his was issued by the presses of Paris or Antwerp. In 1570 several French printers who had been in his employ were burnt for Lutheranism by the Inquisition of Toledo. In fact many of the printers in Spain were Flemings and Frenchmen who, whether heretics or not, found it difficult to accommodate themselves to the rigidity of Spanish observance in religious matters. The records of the Inquisition of Toledo alone contain evidence of their arrest in Barcelona, Alcalá, Salamanca, Toledo, Valladolid and Granada

1586, and then only with additional expurgations to be inserted with the pen. Even after this there were passages which offended the constantly increasing sensitiveness of the censors; further expurgations were ordered in 1613 and again in 1632.[1] Even the great *Biblia Regia*, produced by Árias Montano with the liberal assistance of Philip II., could not escape. Though it had passed the censorship of Rome it excited the criticism of Leon de Castro, a professor of Salamanca, who filled all Spain, Flanders and Italy with his denunciations, rendering it necessary for Montano to appeal personally to the Inquisitor General Quiroga.[2] Subjected to such shackles and exposed to such discouragements it is easy to understand how impossible became in Spain the development of Biblical learning. Fray Luis de Leon in his defence before the Inquisition, declared that he knew many who called themselves theologians and were skilled in scholastics who had never read the Bible through and did not possess a copy of it.[3] Indeed, if we may believe Llorente, the Supreme Council of the Inquisition, in 1559, issued an order that theological professors should surrender all their Hebrew and Greek Bibles, and that all in the hands of booksellers should be seized.[4]

about this period (MSS. of the Königl. Universitäts Bibliothek of Halle, Yc. 20, T. III.).

[1] Reusch, Der Index, I. 204.—Reusch, Luis de Leon und die spanische Inquisition, pp. 58–63.—Menendez y Pelayo, II. 695.

The Vatable Bible gave Robert Estienne in Paris almost equal trouble. In fact he was almost always in hot water with the censorship. In his defence of his Bible he says: "C'est que toutes et quantes fois que ie reduy en memoire la guerre que i'ay eue avec la Sorbone par l'espace de vingt ans ou enuiron ie ne me puis assez esmerueiller comment une si petite et si caduque personne cõme ie suis a eu force pour la soustenir" (Robert Estienne, Les Censures des Theologiens de Paris, 1552, fol. 2, Genève, 1866). For the censorship on his editions of the Bible see D'Argentré, Collect. Judic. de novis Erroribus, II. 1. 143 sqq.

[2] Colleccion de Documentos inéditos, T. XLI. p. 316.

[3] Reusch, Luis de Leon, p. 2.

[4] Llorente, I. 469. There is probably some mistake in this assertion. In the 1559 Index of Valdés there is no general prohibition of Greek and Hebrew

It was in the vernacular Bibles, however, that the greatest danger was felt to lie. The early Spanish reformers were not idle and translations either of the whole or of parts were prepared by Juan de Valdés, Cassiodoro de Reyna, Doctor Juan Perez, Cipriano de Valera, and Francisco de Enzinas which, though printed abroad, had considerable currency in Spain. A Basque translation by Juan de Lizarriga was issued in 1571 at La Rochelle under the auspices of Jeanne d'Albret.[1] These of course were suppressed by all the means to which the perfected organization of the Inquisition lent such tremendous efficacy. Even works of devotion, books of hours and the like are forbidden in the Index of 1559 because they contain fragments and passages of Scripture.[2] In the general rules prefixed to the Index of 1583 there is a sweeping prohibition of vernacular Bibles and all portions thereof; and the strict interpretation designed for this is seen in the exceptions made of texts quoted in Catholic books and the fragments contained in the canon of the Mass, provided they do not stand alone but are embodied in sermons or explications.[3] Even this did not relieve the fears of the more ardent defenders of religion. Melchor Cano, the leading theologian of the day, deplores that books setting forth the mysteries of the faith should be accessible to the vulgar; this he argues is most pestilent, for they are freely circulated, not only with the approbation of the civil authorities but of the Inquisition

Bibles. There is a prohibition of all Hebrew and vernacular books on the Old Law, as well as of all Mahometan books, whether in Arabic or Romance. —Reusch, Die Indices, p 239.

This resulted in virtually suppressing the study of the original Bible. In 1555 Dr. Sigismundo Arques complains that in all Barcelona he cannot buy a Hebrew Bible or vocabulary (MSS. of the Königl. Universitäts Bibliothek of Halle, Yc. 20, T. XI.).

[1] Villanueva, De la Leccion de la Sagrada Escritura, pp. 42, 44.

[2] Reusch, Die Indices, pp. 234–5, 240.—Not long after this St. Pius V. forbade the use of translations of the Hours of the Virgin (Azpilcueta, De Oratione, cap. xxii. No. 104, Ed. Romæ, 1578, p. 642).

[3] Index of Quiroga, 1583, Regla VI. (Reusch, Die Indices, p. 383).

itself.[1] That he was not alone in this is seen by the remark of Azpilcueta that there were earnest men who sought to procure the prohibition of vernacular versions of the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, the *Ave Maria* and *Salve Regina*.[2] The Inquisition did not adopt this latter extreme measure for protecting the public conscience, but it effectually enforced its prohibitions by including in the annual Edict of Denunciations published everywhere, a summons to all the faithful, under pain of the major excommunication and of prosecution for fautorship and suspicion of heresy, to give information as to any one possessing Lutheran books, or Alcorans or other Mahometan works, or Bibles in the vernacular, or other forbidden works.[3] The classing of the Bible with the Koran must have produced a profound impression on the popular mind, and of the two it was the most to be dreaded. This marks the settled policy of the Spanish censorship. The 1640 Index of Sotomayor, in its preliminary general rules, says that experience has shown that more injury than good arises from permitting the Scriptures in the vulgar tongue; therefore not only the vernacular Bible and all its parts are prohibited, whether in print or in MS. but even summaries and compendiums of Holy Writ.[4] Apparently the desire was to make the people forget that such writings existed.

If this was the object it was successful at the end, though the unbending firmness of the Spanish character resisted for a surprising length of time the tremendous pressure brought upon it. Villanueva has collected, with unwearied industry, extracts from a large number of religious writers who flourished between 1550 and 1620, in which, with the utmost boldness, the duty and benefit of studying the Scriptures are

[1] Melchioris Cani de Locis Theologicis Lib. XI. cap. 6.

[2] Azpilcueta, *loc. cit.*

[3] Llorente, IV. 425.—Paramo de Orig. Offic. S. Inquist. p. 628.—In a MS. copy of the Edict used in Sardinia there is simply *biblia* in place of "*biblias en romance*" (MSS. Royal Library of Copenhagen, No. 214 folio).

[4] Index Librorum Prohibitorum 1640, Regla V. (p. viii.).

expatiated upon with an earnestness that could be exceeded by neither Calvinist nor Lutheran. Thus Padre Luis de la Puente, S. J., in 1609, declares that reading Scripture provides us with remedies against vices, arms against temptation, counsel in doubts, consolation in sorrow, assistance in travail, and the means of attaining perfection in all virtues. The Augustinian, Andres Nuñez de Andrada, in 1600, argues that as the Bible was originally written in the vernacular of its day there is no reason to deprive Spaniards of it in their native tongue; as Turks and heretics utter their falsehoods in their own languages, so much greater the necessity that the truth should be attainable in all tongues. The same emphatic utterances are quoted from Carmelites, Franciscans, Dominicans, Benedictines and members of other orders, professors of theology, royal chaplains, etc., showing how wide-spread was the desire, among even the most rigid churchmen, to give to the people free access to the sources of Christianity, and how much intellectual activity of the period was enlisted on the side of religion.[1] But with the first quarter of the seventeenth century Villanueva's authorities come to an end. The generation which had witnessed the prohibition of the Scriptures slowly died out; its protests had been disregarded and its successors were trained in a different school. The Scriptures were forgotten in the intellectual gymnastics of casuistry and in the seductive ingenuity of Probabilism which called forth so many papal reproofs. The Inquisition accomplished its work among both priests and people. Although the Inquisitor General Prado y Cuesta, in 1747, complains of the inordinate desire of many persons to have the Bible in the vernacular,[2] yet Villanueva, himself a *calificador* of the Inquisition, writing in 1791, says that when the people are

[1] Villanueva, De la Leccion de la Sagrada Escritura, Append. I. This remarkable collection occupies 113 double-columned folio pages and presents extracts from thirty-four authors.

[2] Edicto de 13 de Hebrero de 1747 (MSS. of David Fergusson, Esq.).

deprived of Scripture the clergy ought to saturate themselves with it, in place of which they utterly neglect its study; as for the people who once sought it so eagerly, many now care nothing for it, most of them are ignorant of its existence, and those who think about it regard it with horror and detestation.[1]

ORGANIZATION OF CENSORSHIP.

Two functions were to be provided for in the creation of a system which should effectually preserve the faithful from the contamination of evil by keeping from them the knowledge of its existence. The first of these was the examination of all books prior to publication, permitting only the innocent to be printed; the second was a further scrutiny of the issues of the press, and the condemnation or expurgation of those containing errors which had escaped the vigilance of the preliminary censorship. Of these duties the first was undertaken by the State, and the second was confided to the Inquisition as the conservator of orthodoxy.

We have seen that the law of Ferdinand and Isabella in 1502 forbade the printing or importation of any book without an examination and licence; and that in 1527 the chancellor, Gattinara, reassured Erasmus against a dreaded attack from Edward Lee by telling him that in Spain no book could see the light without a careful preliminary inspection, which was rigidly enforced. As the rule was not yet established of requiring a printed licence in front of all publications we lack means of ascertaining the details of this censorship, but

[1] Villanueva, pp. 56, 200.—"Notorio es el zelo con que el Santo Oficio ha procurado apartarlas de las manos del vulgar; con lo qual el pueblo mismo que entonces las buscaba aora las mira con horror y las detesta; muchos no se cuidan de ellas, los mas ni saben si las hay."

as yet the law of Ferdinand and Isabella was in force as the only one on the subject in existence. In 1540 Hugo de Celso cites it in saying that no books can be printed or imported without previous examination by the royal deputies whom he enumerates, showing that some change had been made in the interval. The presidents of the royal courts, he tells us, perform the function of censors in Valladolid and Granada, the archbishops in Toledo and Seville, and the bishops in Búrgos and Salamanca. Some little alteration had likewise taken place in the penalties which at that time were the burning of all unlicensed books, and a mulct of their value to be divided between the fisc, the judge, and the informer.[1] Thus the Inquisition had no legal status in the matter of preliminary licensing, but its growing influence led it to be occasionally appealed to in advance as a judge. In 1532 Friar Matthias Wissen, the Commissioner of the Observantines, in authorizing the printing of the sermons of Fray Francisco de Osuna, alludes to the permission of the Inquisition having already been obtained,[2] and Ticknor mentions books of 1536, 1541, and 1546 as bearing records of examination by the Inquisition.[3] As late as 1552 the *Traduccion Castillana del Homiliario* of Juan de Molina contains a cer-

[1] Hugo de Celso, Reportorio de las Leyes de Castilla, *s.v. Imprimir*, Alcalá, 1540.

Sandoval (Historia de la Vida de Carlos V., P. II. p. 808) cites various edicts of Charles from 1537 to 1538 establishing a censorship and punishing disobedience with death and confiscation, but as Celso makes no reference to them I presume they were confined to his paternal dominions.

The account which Juan Gines de Sepúlveda gives, about 1552, of his trouble in obtaining a licence for his defence of the Spanish conquerors of the New World, in reply to Bishop Las Casas, shows that special examiners were sometimes called upon in contravention of the regular routine. He also reproaches Las Casas for having published his book without a licence, showing that this was sometimes done (Colleccion de Documentos inéditos, T. LXXI. p. 335).

[2] Fran. ab Ossuna Pars Occidentalis, Venetiis, 1572.

[3] Ticknor's Spanish Literature, I. 421 (Ed. 1864).

tificate of examination by the Inquisitors of Valencia,[1] but this was under the crown of Aragon, where, as we shall see, the law of Ferdinand and Isabella was not in force. As a rule, the books of the period, when bearing a licence, have it directly from the crown with no indication that the bishops were performing the functions confided to them by the law of 1502.[2]

With the increasing flood of heretical literature and the growing sense of the necessity to exclude it, more precise regulations were felt to be requisite, and in 1554 the matter was definitely settled by an edict, in the names of Charles V. and Philip, confining to the Royal Council the function of issuing licences for the printing of books of all descriptions; the Council was charged to be scrupulously careful in the preliminary examinations, for in consequence of the facility previously prevailing many useless and unprofitable books had been printed. In the case of all works of importance the original MS. was to be deposited with the Council, so as to detect any alterations made on press.[3] The Inquisition made no opposition to being thus excluded. So long as it retained the right to subsequent censorship it controlled the press effectually, and it consoled itself with the reflection that it thus escaped the "inconvenience" of licensing a book in which errors might subsequently be discovered, which would be a severe shock to the infallibility which it desired to preserve in the eyes of the public. At the same time it retained the right to put a stop to the printing of any work which might be denounced to it.[4]

[1] Villanueva, Append. I. p. x.

[2] Thus the works of Bishop Antonio de Guevara, Valladolid, 1545, bear a licence and privilege of Charles V. in which he states that he has had the work examined by members of the Royal Council. The *De Ornatu Animæ* of Francisco Ortiz, Alcalá, 1548, has licence and privilege from Prince Philip, in which he says he has had the work examined, without specifying by whom. Many works of the period bear no licence.

[3] Nueva Recop. Lib. II. Tit. iv. ley 48 (Novís. Recop. VIII. xvi. 2).

[4] MSS. Royal Library of Copenhagen, No. 218*b* fol. pp. 331, 332.

Thus censorship was gradually becoming systematized. It was quite time, if the faithful were to be preserved from heresy, for Alfonso de Castro, writing in 1547, feels obliged to argue at much length to prove the danger arising from such books and the need of prohibitive legislation. There were no laws, he said, either papal or imperial, to punish the possession and reading of wicked books. In Spain the inquisitors had prohibited many works of heretics by name and had made diligent exertions to suppress them, to which was attributable the freedom of Spain from heresy, but many people held that the condemnation of a book merely declared that it was not to be regarded as authoritative, and that there was neither sin nor crime in owning or studying it. To be sure, the bull *In Cœna Domini* of Paul III. (1536) had excommunicated all who read Lutheran books without a papal licence, but as it was limited to these all other heretical books were regarded as free. Soon after this the heart of de Castro was gladdened by the bull *Cum meditatio* of Julius III. (April 29, 1550), prohibiting the possession and reading of all heretic books under the full penalties of heresy, and he made haste to print it in a subsequent edition of his treatise.[1]

De Castro's appeal for punitive legislation seems to have been neglected in a way only accountable by the absence of Charles and Philip and their preoccupation with the affairs of Germany, Flanders, and England. The discovery, in 1557, of Lutheran heresy, with its headquarters in Valladolid and extensive ramifications throughout the land, was due to the arrest of Juliano Hernandez, who had brought to Seville from Geneva a stock of heretic books.[2] The investigation which followed created an immense sensation and explains the enactment by the Infanta Juana, in the name of Philip II., of the Pragmatic Sanction of 1558, issued September 7 at Valladolid. If there had been lukewarmness and negligence

[1] Alphonsi de Castro de justa Hæreticor. Punitione Lib. II. c. xv.–xvii. (pp. 1313–38).—Septimi Decretal. Lib. v. Tit. iv. c. 2.

[2] Llorente, II. 214.

hitherto they were now amply atoned for. The edict commenced by reciting that in spite of the law of 1502 and of the inquisitors and episcopal provisors who every year publish the names of condemned books, prohibiting under heavy censures and penalties their reading and possession, there are many heretical books in circulation, both printed at home and imported, and that the heretics from abroad are making in this manner great efforts to spread their damnable doctrines. There are besides many books, useless, immoral, and of evil example, so that the Córtes have petitioned for a remedy. It is therefore ordered, under penalty of death and confiscation of all property, that no bookseller or other person shall sell or keep any book, printed or to be printed, in any language or on any subject, which has been condemned by the Inquisition, and all such books shall be publicly burnt. The catalogue of books prohibited by the Inquisition shall be printed; every bookseller shall keep a copy and shall expose it where the public can read it. The same penalty of death and confiscation is provided for the importing of any books in Romance printed abroad—even in Aragon, Catalonia, Valencia, and Navarre—which do not bear a printed licence issued by the Royal Council. As for books in Romance heretofore printed outside of Castile and not prohibited by the Inquisition, they shall all be presented to the alcalde mayor or corregidor of the place, who shall send lists of them to the Royal Council for decision, and until such decision is rendered no one shall keep them for sale under pain of confiscation and perpetual banishment. In addition to this a general inspection of all the books in the kingdom is ordered. Those in the hands of booksellers and in private libraries are to be examined under the direction of the bishops in conjunction with the royal judges and corregidores and the universities, and all books regarded as suspicious or immoral, even if licensed, are to be sequestrated until the decision of the Council is rendered upon them. The superiors of all the religious orders shall cause a similar visitation to be made of the libraries of all religious

houses. An investigation of the same kind is moreover directed to be made annually hereafter.

Having thus provided for the past and present, regulations equally thorough are enacted for the future. Under penalty of death and confiscation no one is to give out for printing any book in any language without previously submitting it to the Royal Council, which shall cause it to be examined and issue a licence therefor. To prevent alterations in the printing the original MS. shall be signed on every leaf by a secretary of the royal chamber, who shall mark and rubricate every correction or alteration in it and shall state at the end the number of leaves and of alterations. This copy, after being used in printing, shall be returned to the Council with one or two copies of the printed book, when they shall be compared to see that they correspond, and the MS. shall be retained. Every book shall present at its front the licence, the *tassa* or price at which it is to be sold, the privilege, if there is one, the names of author and printer, and the place of printing. The same formalities are to be observed with new editions, and a record of all licences with full details is to be kept by the Council. New editions of ritual or choir books, school books, etc., are subjected only to episcopal licence, under penalty of confiscation and perpetual banishment, but all new works of the kind require the licence of the Council. Matters concerning the Inquisition can be licensed by the inquisitor general; those connected with the Cruzada by the commissioner general, while legal papers and pleadings can be freely printed. It was not enough, however, thus to regulate the press. Infection could be communicated by MSS., and, therefore, the penalty of death and confiscation is decreed for all who own or show to others a MS. on any religious subject without first submitting it to the Council, which shall examine it and either license or destroy it—in the latter case keeping a record.[1] The excep-

[1] Nueva Recop. Lib. I. Tit. vii. ley 24 (Novís. Recop. VIII. xvi. 3; xviii. 1).

tion, however, made in favor of reprints of ritual and choir books seems to have been regarded as dangerous, or the bishops were not trusted, and in 1569 even these books were subjected to the stringent regulations provided for other publications. The judges also apparently were suspected of lukewarmness in the business, for they were threatened with deprivation of office and a fine of 50,000 maravedís for neglect to proceed against any delinquent.[1]

I give this full abstract of the savage law of 1558 not only because of its significance as to the uncompromising character of Spanish legislation on these subjects, which hesitated at nothing to accomplish its ends, but because it remained in force until the nineteenth century. It was supplemented by numerous edicts, for the matter was one which awakened continual solicitude; precautions were adopted to prevent its evasion as ingenuity devised means to elude it; the machinery through which it worked was altered from time to time to render it more effective, but the principles which it established and its provisions for enforcing those principles remained unaltered until the ancient monarchy was swept away in the Napoleonic revolution. I am not aware that a human being was actually put to death for violating its provisions, unless the offence was complicated with heresy express or implied, but such violation remained to the end a capital crime. The only modification of this ferocious penalty occurs in a revision of the press laws in 1752, in which death and confiscation are denounced against any one printing without licence a book or paper concerning religion, or reprinting, importing, selling or possessing one prohibited by the Inquisition, with the saving clause that the offence must have been committed with intent to favor heresy; in the absence of such malice the punishment is the milder one of a fine of two hundred ducats and six years of Presidio, or hard labor in the African garrisons, equivalent to the French

[1] Nueva Recop. I. vii. 27 (Novís. Recop. VIII. xvi. 4).

bagne.[1] In 1804, moreover, the attention of all concerned in the censorship was especially called to the laws of 1558 and 1752 and their enforcement was strictly enjoined.[2] When the innocent possession of a condemned book was thus rigorously punished the importance of the functions of the Inquisition in compiling the Index can be estimated.

The supreme power of the State had thus definitely laid down the principles to be observed in dealing with the press and had prescribed the several functions of the bodies to whom was confided the protection of the people from the infection of heresy. The Royal Council carefully sifted out the tares from the wheat before publication, and the Inquisition scrutinized with a more minute and searching examination the errors which might escape the first inspection. The decisions of both were enforced with penal sanctions of the severest character, to be risked only by a zeal thirsting for martyrdom.

To render this legislation effective the first work to be accomplished was the framing of a catalogue or index of condemned books sufficiently complete to serve for the efficient sifting of libraries and booksellers' stocks. All efforts in this direction had hitherto been tentative and meagre, while heretic literature was daily multiplying, and even the works of the orthodox contained many passages offensive to the aroused sensitiveness of the censors of the faith. As a preliminary the Supreme Council of the Inquisition issued an edict enforcing

[1] Novísima Recop. Lib. VIII. Tit. xvi. ley 22, cap. 5.

[2] Alcubilla, Códigos Antiguos Españoles, p. 1580.

Even the enlightened Carlos III., after the expulsion of the Jesuits in 1767, freely threatened death and confiscation for the printing, selling, or possession of any print relative to that affair (Novís. Recop. VIII. xviii. 5. See also leyes 6, 7, and 8).

It must be admitted that at the time of its enactment the law of 1558 only embodied the current convictions of statesmanship on the matter. In 1550 at the Diet of Augsburg death and confiscation were threatened for reading or selling any of the works contained in the Index of Louvain.—J. G. Sepulvedæ de rebus Gestis Caroli V., Lib. XXVI. (Opp. Ed. 1780, T. II. p. 403).

its previous ones with additional penalties and instructing inquisitors to seize all books contained in the earlier lists, the heretical ones to be publicly burnt and the others to be expurgated.[1] Then it forthwith addressed itself to the preparation of an Index much more elaborate than its predecessors, which was ready for publication by August 17, 1559. It was issued under papal authority. The prefatory edict of Inquisitor General Valdés introduces a brief of Paul IV., dated January 4, 1559, to the effect that Valdés had complained to him that many persons, both lay and clerical, persisted in reading and keeping heretical books, claiming that they had licences so to do, wherefore Valdés had applied to him for a remedy. All such licences had been revoked by the papal letters *Quia in futurorum* of December 21, 1558, which are incorporated herein. Except inquisitors general no one, even of the rank of kings and cardinals, shall possess or read such books, but shall surrender them within a term to be fixed by the inquisitors of each district, under pain of excommunication and the other penalties provided for the offence, and Valdés is authorized and instructed to enforce this vigorously in Spain. Armed with this authority Valdés proceeds to say that many persons, pretending ignorance, keep and read such books, wherefore the Supreme Council had determined that all such books should be examined by learned and conscientious men and a catalogue be made of those heretical, suspect, or by a heretic author, or liable to cause scandal or inconvenience, which catalogue would be printed and circulated, so that all should know what to avoid. It is therefore ordered that no one, of whatever rank, shall read or possess the books in this catalogue or any others by heretic writers, and no printer or merchant shall import or sell them, under pain of the major excommunication, *latæ sententiæ*, a fine of two hundred ducats to the king and prosecution for disobedience and suspicion of heresy. Every inquisitor is ordered to pub-

[1] Llorente, I. 468.

lish this in his district and cause it to be published by all preachers in their pulpits. In the annual Edicts of Denunciation, moreover, all persons are to be summoned, under penalties to be determined by the inquisitors, to give information as to persons reading or possessing such books.[1] In time also the confessional was called into play by requiring all confessors especially to examine their penitents as to the possession of prohibited books or the knowledge of their possession by others, and to refuse absolution until the books were surrendered.[2]

It is observable that in this the Inquisition carefully abstains from alluding to the savage threats of the royal edict of the previous year, but confines itself strictly to the punishments which came within its customary functions. The same reticence was not preserved by the commentators of the period, nor put in practice by the tribunals of the Holy Office. Bishop Simancas deplores the depraved curiosity of the sons of Eve, eager for the knowledge of good and evil, and persisting in reading the books of heretics. He deprecates the assertion of some legists that the possession of a heretic book is absolute proof of heresy, requiring no further evidence for conviction, and inclines to the milder opinion that it merely renders the owner suspect, but he concludes that the decision must be left to the judge, who should weigh the attending circumstances. Under papal licence, learned men may read the books of heretics, especially those on law, medicine, and the useful arts, so as to convey to good Catholics the useful things, to the possession of which the heretics have no right, but in so doing the names of the authors must be rigidly suppressed. As regards punishment for the unauthorized possession of heretic books, the Inquisition cannot render a sentence of blood, but the example of the Christian emperors who visited the crime with death is to be borne in mind in

[1] Reusch, Die Indices, pp. 210–15.
[2] MSS. of David Fergusson, Esq.

leading us to increased severity. If those who do not suppress libellous writings are capitally punished, how much more severe should be the penalty of those who preserve heretic books, especially Lutheran, which are nothing but impious libels on the popes, on the Church, and on religion![1] Thus, as in the matter of heresy, the Inquisition was held to escape the responsibility of the death sentence, while handing over the culprit to the secular authorities for execution.

Peña, in his commentary on Eymerich's *Directorium*, gives us greater detail, which is instructive as to the working of the censorship in the hands of the Church. It is a mistake, he tells us, to suppose that the owner of a heretic book can burn it; he should deliver it to an inquisitor, whose business it is then to trace the source whence it came. Confessors cannot grant absolution to the possessors of such books, for under the bull *In Cœna Domini* this is a sin reserved to the Holy See. Books inherited from the dead must be subjected to examination by the proper officials before the heirs can enjoy their possession, and it is the same with all books brought to a town which must be inspected before they can be read. Like Simancas, he treats the question of the penalty for the possession of heretic books as a troublesome one, and cites numerous authorities to show that it involves conviction for heresy, but he argues that the owner is only suspect of heresy, and that it is for the inquisitor to determine whether this suspicion is light, vehement, or violent, by weighing carefully the circumstances—the character of the accused and of the

[1] Simancæ de Cathol. Institutis Tit. XXXVIII. No. 19–27.

The non-heretic writings of heretics were a source of considerable debate. Alfonso de Castro (De justa Punit. Hæret. Lib. II. c. xvii. p. 1331) says that the books of a condemned heretic are not condemned so as to prevent the Catholic from reading them, but are condemned so far as citing them as authorities. The Tridentine Rules (Regula II.) allow the use of books written by heretics on other subjects than religion, after examination and approbation by bishops and inquisitors. In the Roman Indexes, however, the first class consisted of the simple names of authors all of whose works without exception were prohibited.

book, how he obtained it, whether he has read it once or oftener, or has communicated it to others, whether he surrendered it willingly and applied for absolution—all of which may extenuate or aggravate the crime. He does not allude to the ingenious solution of Farinacci (*De Hæresi*, Quæst. 180 No. 6, 8) that he who keeps and reads a heretic book is not a heretic in the sight of God though he is so in the sight of man. As for the penalty, by the civil law it is death, but the Inquisition passes no sentences of blood, and Peña has no doubt that in some cases purgation can be prescribed or abjuration and appropriate penance such as fasting, prayers, or pilgrimages.[1] As for printers, he quotes the Novel of Justinian threatening amputation of the hand, and the Lateran canon of 1515, and concludes that the copyists and secret printers of forbidden books can be punished at the discretion of the inquisitor. Then there are the carriers who bring so much heretical poison from infected lands to Catholic countries. When this is done ignorantly they should be leniently treated, and ignorance is always to be presumed, but when there is guilty knowledge the inquisitor should visit it severely, with excommunication, confiscation, and scourging or exile.[2] So little did the Spanish Inquisition tolerate any

[1] Pegnæ Comment. ad Eymerici Direct. Inquis. pp. 92-4. Cf. Paramo de Orig. Officio S. Inquis. pp. 798, 824.

Under the provisions of the canon law, as pointed out by Cardinal Francisco de Toledo (Instructio Sacerdotum, Lib. I. c. xix. § 9, Ed. Romæ, 1618, p. 41), knowingly to read even a few lines of a heretic book incurs the excommunication of the bull *In Cœna Domini*, but it is different when the book is only a prohibited one, such as the Bible in the vernacular, when simply the penalties provided by the Index are incurred. The subject, in fact, naturally lent itself to the laborious ingenuity of the casuists. A letter from a heretic containing heresy could be read without incurring excommunication, because it was not a book, but if it formed part of a book, such as a dedication or an epistle to the reader, it could not be read. If a forbidden book was in several volumes and one of them contained no heresy, that one could be read. Ignorance that a book was heretical served as a valid excuse, and so forth (Alberghini Manuale Qualificatorum, Cæsaraugustæ, 1671, pp. 130–1).

[2] Pegnæ Comment. ad Eymeric. p. 119.

interference with its jurisdiction that about 1565 it suppressed a papal Jubilee indulgence because it contained a clause permitting the absolution by confessors of those who possessed prohibited books.[1]

An instructive case occurred in 1561, when a French priest named Jean Fesque, who had been four years in Spain, breakfasting in a wineshop in Toledo, handed to Melchor Trechel, the son of the vintner, a little book and asked him if he could tell where it was printed, as it bore neither imprint nor place of publication. Melchor was a bookseller's assistant, and showed the book to his employer, Miguel Rosas, who at once said that it was prohibited and must be taken to the Inquisition. Fesque vainly protested that he did not wish to be burnt for it, as his acquaintance, Antonio Marcel, had been not long before for a similar cause, but Melchor refused to return it. He carried it to the Inquisition, which promptly arrested Fesque the same day. On examination he declared himself to be an Auvergnat from Saint-Flour; he manifested the least possible desire for martyrdom, and with sobs and tears protested his devotion to the Church and begged for absolution and penance. His story was that two or three days before a boy in the street had sold the volume to him for eight maravedís as a book of chants, as it contained the psalms with the musical notation; he was given to psalmody and had left in Madrid the book which he ordinarily carried. The book was in French; as an Auvergnat he could only read it with difficulty, and had not examined it. The volume turned out to be one of most compromising character—the *Pseaulmes de David*, translated by Clément Marot and Théodore de Bèze,[2] followed by *Le Cathecisme, c'est à dire le*

[1] MSS. Royal Library of Copenhagen, No. 218*b* fol. p. 214.

[2] Marot's translation of thirty of the Psalms enjoyed great favor at the court of Francis I., where the royal personages each selected one and adopted it as suitable to him or herself, but the Sorbonne speedily condemned it as well as the twenty more psalms added by Marot after his flight to Geneva. He soon after died, in 1544, in poverty and exile in Piedmont (Florimund. Raemundi Synopsis Controversiarum Lib. VIII. cap. xvi.—D'Argentré,

Formuleire—and a comparison of it with a copy of the Catechism of Doctor Juan Perez, produced from the records of the trial of Jacopo Sobalti, who had not long before been burnt by the Inquisition of Toledo, showed that the two were practically identical.[1]

The serious character of the offence, in the eyes of the inquisitors, is seen in the accusation of the promotor fiscal, or prosecuting officer, which charges Fesque as a propagator of Lutheranism, as an excommunicate perjurer, as a heretic and apostate engaged in disseminating the doctrines contained in the book, and demands that he be punished with confiscation and burning, and that the customary disabilities be inflicted on his posterity.[2] The case was certainly grave, for he had handed the book to another person which technically was

Collect. Judic. de novis Erroribus, II. 1. 134). Beza subsequently completed the translation. The book is absent from the Index of Valdés, 1559, but appears in the Antwerp Index of 1570 (p. 79), while in that of Quiroga, 1583, all of Marot's works are prohibited (Reusch, Die Indices, p. 445).

[1] Doctor Juan Perez translated the Psalms and wrote a Catechism, based on Calvin's, though not a mere translation. It was printed in Geneva by Crespin in 1556, though it bore the imprint of Pietro Daniel, Venice. In the Index of Valdés, 1559, it is prohibited under two titles, *Catechismo* and *Summario*, and the inquisitorial efforts for its destruction were so successful that Professor Böhmer has been able to find but a single copy, which is in the Hof-Bibliothek of Vienna (Böhmer, Bibliotheca Wiffeniana, II. 86.—Reusch Die Indices, 232, 239).

The contents of the two large casks of books brought to Seville in 1557 by the intrepid Julian Hernandez consisted of Perez's Testament and his Psalms and Catechism. A spy of the Holy Office obtained one of the books and denounced Hernandez to the Inquisition, which in a short time had eight hundred prisoners on its hands, not only crowding its prisons but obliging it to quarter them in private houses. For three years Hernandez heroically resisted torture and persuasion, perishing in the *auto de fé* of 1560, where also Juan Perez was burnt in effigy (Reg. Gons. Montani S. Inq. Hisp. Artes aliquot detectæ, Heidelbergæ, 1567, p. 219.—Llorente, II. 279).

[2] "A vuestras señorias pido manden declarar y declaren al dicho Mosen Juan frances por herege apostata de nuestra santa fe catholica, luterano, enseñador de la secta de Lutero, yncubridor y participante de hereges, excommunicado perjuro y en verdad caydo e yncurrido en confiscacion y pedimiento de todos sus bienes y hazienda . . . . aca relaxandole la persona a la justicia y tribunal seglar."

dissemination of heresy. The case dragged on in the dilatory fashion customary with the Inquisition. All possible incriminating evidence was hunted up, but, except the fatal book itself, this amounted to little. In defence, Fesque handed in the names of eight priests to testify to his character. Five of these, who were easily accessible in Toledo, were summoned and bore witness that they had known him for from one to three years, that he was regular in the celebration of mass and in his devotions, and that he bore a good reputation.

Finally, after more than five months had passed, a consultation was held by the inquisitors with the episcopal ordinary and three theologians and jurists. There was really nothing before them save the one fact of his having handed the book to Trechel, but this was sufficient to create "suspicion of heresy," and "suspicion" implied conviction unless removed in some way. They therefore naturally had recourse to the universal solvent of all doubts in the criminal jurisprudence of the period—torture—which was unanimously voted. A month was allowed to elapse, however, before it was administered. Fesque manifested unexpected powers of endurance, and although the torture was unusually severe and protracted it failed to elicit a confession, although he prayed to be put to death. At last he was carried back to his cell with the warning that his judges were not yet satisfied, and that the torture would be continued if he did not confess. This was ineffective and five days later another consultation was held. It had before it absolutely no additional evidence, but, in the curious judicial logic of the time, suspicion of heresy unsupported by positive evidence was purged by endurance of torture, and now his acquittal and discharge were voted with the same unanimity as before. Two days later he was unceremoniously dismissed without a word of commiseration for his six months' incarceration and the useless agony of body and mind inflicted upon him.[1]

[1] Proceso contra Mossen Juan Fesque (MSS. of the Königl. Universitäts Bibliothek of Halle, Yc. 20, Tom. III.).

The readiness and effectiveness with which the accusation of meddling with prohibited books could be used are illustrated in a case occurring in 1569. Hanz de Brunsvique, a German, formerly a clockmaker, but then serving in the royal Guarda Tudesca, was arrested on the charge that some years before, while in the service of Thomas Martin, clockmaker to the king, on the occasion of the prosecution of the latter by the Inquisition, he had carried off and secreted or destroyed some compromising Lutheran books. Although, in obedience to inquisitorial rules, the names of the witnesses were concealed, Hanz managed to divine them and disabled them by proving that they were personal enemies who had quarrelled with him from various causes. He was also fortunately able to show that he could not read or write, and the prosecution fell to the ground. It was not even considered necessary to torture him, and he escaped with only three months' incarceration and suspense.[1]

THE FUNCTIONS OF THE INQUISITION.

Thus inevitably the enforcement of the statutes against dangerous or suspicious books fell into the hands of the dreaded Holy Office. The State contented itself with the preliminary business of preventing the printing of such works, for which, as we shall see hereafter, a cumbrous machinery was devised, exceedingly oppressive to literature; and during the later periods it exercised a watchful care over the custom houses; but in the wide field of designating error, of inspecting booksellers' shops and libraries, and of seeing to the execution of the laws, the Inquisition reigned supreme. In pursuance of this duty it issued successive Indexes of books prohibited or subject to expurgation, and it accompanied

[1] Proceso contra Hanz Brunsvi (MSS. of the Königl. Universitäts Bibliothek of Halle, Yc. 20, T. III.).

these with elaborate rules, laying down general principles of prohibition and formulating instructions to booksellers and importers. The publication of these Indexes was a solemn ecclesiastical function in which the Inquisition made an impressive exhibition of its authority.[1]

It is true that under the constitution of the Church the bishops enjoyed an equal share in this jurisdiction, and the earlier papal bulls and the Tridentine Rules are careful to reserve it to them. Peña tells us that bishops in their dioceses and inquisitors in their several districts can condemn through their own inherent jurisdiction and without special papal authority any books containing heretical propositions, even if their authors have not been condemned; also, books suspect of heresy by Catholic authors, or those not in conformity with good morals, or works on astrology and divination inferring erroneous notions as to free-will; also poetry, classical and modern, which is mostly lascivious and provocative of licentiousness—all such books can be suppressed if printed, or their printing can be prohibited by either bishop or inquisitor. Also useless books, treating of light and ridiculous matters which bishops ought not to allow to be printed or circulated within their dioceses; and finally, whatsoever causes justify them in prosecuting men give them similar jurisdiction against books.[2] This provided for a minute and all-pervading interference with writers and readers which a meddling bishop could render excessively exacerbating, and doubtless the power was occasionally exercised to the intense annoyance of the cultured classes, but as a rule we hear little or nothing of episcopal censorship outside of the dominions of the crown of Aragon. The bishops for the most part were worldly and negligent, the Inquisition was active and

[1] See the allusion to the publication of the Index of Sotomayor in 1640, in Josef Pellicer's *Avisos historicos* (Valladares, Semanario erúdito, T. XXXI. p. 187).

[2] Pegnæ Comment. ad Eymeric. p. 315.

ambitious; it had the unqualified support of the State and its machinery was so perfect and all-pervading that it speedily appropriated the whole field to itself. It became a recognized rule that while the bishops might claim to share in the cognizance of immoral books and those on sorcery and magic, works suspect of heresy were reserved solely for the Holy Office.[1] How perfect became the machinery of the Holy Office can be understood by a single instance. In 1794 there appeared a book by Santiago Felipe Puglia entitled *Disengaño del Hombre*, with the fictitious imprint of Philadelphia—probably one of the politico-philosophical works of which that period was so prolific. It was put on the Index by the Inquisition and the prohibition reached the city of Mexico October 24th of the same year. I have before me the certificate, duly executed February 15, 1795, by Padre Feliciano Meneses y Rejon, priest of Hopelcheen in Yucatan, that he had that day, from the pulpit, amid the solemnities of the mass, published the prohibition warning his little congregation of Indians and half-breeds not to read the dangerous book and to surrender forthwith all copies in their possession.[2] In every corner of the dominions of the Spanish crown, on which the sun never set, the edicts of the Supreme Council, sitting in Madrid, were made known and enforced with the unsparing rigor of the dreaded tribunal.

When an obnoxious book escaped the vigilance of the examiners of the Royal Council and was printed with the due formalities, it was the duty of anyone who detected a doubtful expression in it to denounce it to the Inquisition, or the Supreme Council could take the initiative in ordering its ex-

[1] Alberghini Manuale Qualificatorum, Cæsaraugustæ, 1671, pp. 132–33.

[2] MSS. of David Fergusson, Esq.

The Mexican Inquisition also exercised independent jurisdiction of censorship. I owe to the kindness of General Riva Palacio a copy of an edict of 1698 condemning an edition of the prophecies of Nostradamus issued at Bordeaux in 1689 and also a number of works, sermons, etc., printed in Mexico, all of which are ordered to be surrendered under the customary pain of excommunication and a fine of 200 ducats.

amination. The matters liable to condemnation were by no means confined to heresy, but covered a wide region of morals and of ecclesiastical and secular politics, for the Inquisition was too useful an instrument of statecraft not to be effectively employed in maintaining monarchical as well as clerical absolutism. The rules which it laid down required that not only the text of a book should be examined, but also the notes, summaries, preface, dedication, and index. The matters to be searched for included, besides heretical propositions, doubtful or equivocal expressions, new and profane words invented by heretics to deceive the faithful, erroneous translations of sacred texts, or texts profanely applied, everything savoring of idolatry or paganism, of superstition, sorcery or divination, of subjecting human free-will to fate, all passages detracting from the reputation of others, especially of princes and ecclesiastics, or contrary to good morals or Christian discipline, or opposed to the liberties, immunities and jurisdiction of the Church; also those which, based upon the opinions and examples of the heathen, support political tyranny falsely called reason of state; those which discredit the rites of religion and the religious orders and their members; also all jests and utterances offensive and prejudicial to individuals; and finally all images and portraits are to be suppressed which represent with nimbus or other symbols of sanctity persons not canonized or beatified by the Holy See.[1]

The process of examining a book was known as *calificacion* and the examiners as *calificadores*. They were not to exceed eight in number, they were to be men eminent as theologians and of approved virtue, and not less than forty-five years of age. They received no salary and were required to act gratuitously, even when they had to make a journey in discharge of duty.[2] The customary course was to send the in-

[1] Indice Expurgatorio, Regla xvi. (Index of 1640, p. xxviii.; Índice Último, 1790, p. xxv.).

[2] MSS. Royal Library of Copenhagen, No. 213 fol. p. 136; No. 218*b* fol. p. 320.

criminated book to one, who returned it with a written opinion of which an unsigned copy was sent with the book to a second; if the two agreed, the inquisitors transmitted the papers to the Supreme Council for its action, and when the case originated in the provinces the Council usually had a second *calificacion* made in Madrid.[1] According to the report of the *calificadores*, if unfavorable, the book would either be prohibited entirely or ordered to be expurgated. The censure thus passed was summary and final; no appeal was entertained and it could not be altered. A copy of it was never given to the author, for this would have been a violation of the impenetrable secrecy of the Holy Office. The author was not heard in defence of his book; if he was a Catholic, or had died as such, no prosecution was brought against him unless the propositions censured savored of heresy: but he could defend himself against any personal censure implied in the judgment, while not allowed to ask for an alteration of the decision.[2] In the celebrated case of Carranza, Arch-

[1] Llorente, I. 483.

[2] MSS. Royal Library of Copenhagen, No. 218*b* fol. pp. 319–20, 322.

Yet in spite of the unalterable character of the inquisitorial decrees, changing conditions sometimes produced retractions, as in the quarrel between the Jesuits and the Carmelites over the absurd pretensions of the latter to date back to Enoch. In 1695 Carmelite influence procured the condemnation of those passages of Father Papenbroek in the *Acta Sanctorum* wherein he proved the modern origin of the Order. In 1715 the Jesuits succeeded in having this edict rescinded, though the Inquisition ordered stricken out a passage qualifying the library of the Escorial as a place "ubi codicum manuscriptorum cadavera asservantur et putrescunt." Again, in the Index of 1747, wherein Jesuit influence reigned supreme, it was stated that the defence of the Bollandists had led the Supreme Council to recall the sentence of condemnation.—Reusch, Der Index der verbotenen Bücher, II. 275.

In the MSS. of the Bodleian Library (Arch Seld. 130) there is an opinion of a *calificador* on the defence of the *Historia Profetica*, showing that the *calificadores* were sometimes assembled and had warm debates over disputed points. In this case the questions involved were those of the Carmelite quarrel—as to the existence of monachism under the Old Law; whether Enoch and Elias will be apostles at the Day of Judgment and as such can give definitions of faith; whether John Bishop of Jerusalem can be called a

bishop of Toledo, who had himself long served as a *calificador*, when his *Comentarios* were condemned immediately upon their appearance in 1558, he vainly asked to be heard in explanation of the censured passages.[1]

If a work was regarded as wholly injurious to Church or State in its tendency, it was prohibited, and this prohibition might, in special cases, be extended to those who held licences to read prohibited books in general. Unlike the Roman Congregations which generally contented themselves with the bald enumeration of the title and author's name, the Spanish edicts usually give the reasons, which frequently afforded an opportunity of branding book and writer in the most insulting manner.[2] If the book as a whole was innocent except in certain passages, it was prohibited *donec corrigatur* or *donec expurgetur*—until corrected or expurgated—and a list was made of the objectionable portions which all possessors of the work were required to blot out (*borrar*), or to bring their copies to the Inquisition for the purpose within six months of the date of the edict, under penalty of their confiscation and

saint. The future apostolic authority of Enoch and Elias was the point which caused the chief discussion. The sanctity of John of Jerusalem seems to have been conceded, though St. Jerome had denounced him as a heretic on account of his share in the quarrel between Theodore of Alexandria and St. John Chrysostom, and though the Spanish Index of 1707 (I. 45) deprived him even of the subordinate title of Beatus.

[1] Llorente, III. 224.

[2] Thus, in a decree of 1790 now before me, the *Apologia delle Rizoluzioni Cesaree* is forbidden, among other reasons, because it defends toleration and advocates liberty of conscience. Another Italian work, *Della intollerabilità de' Frati, specialmente Domenicani*, is condemned "porque sobre ser un folleto despreciable, está lleno de falsedades y de injurias."

Yet the Roman Congregations sometimes allowed themselves the same privilege of abusing an author. A decree in my possession, issued by the Roman Inquisition September 4, 1765, as one of the incidents in the desperate struggle preceding the fall of the Jesuits, condemns a pamphlet just printed against them in Naples as written "ab anonymo impudentissimo authore," who is described as "homo perditus, labiis veneno aspidum pollutis, et calamo felle draconis illito, per execrabile scelus carpere non est veritus, etc."

a fine of fifty ducats.[1] The passages thus expunged were rendered completely illegible, usually with printer's ink, apparently laid on with a brush, and where they happened to be frequent the appearance can easily be imagined. Nor is it difficult to appreciate the effect upon the mind of the author whose disgrace was thus perpetuated through the very labors which he had hoped would bring him reputation and perhaps immortality. Where the passage thus *borrado* could be stricken out without destroying the sense it was well, but where it could not the context was allowed to shift for itself.

In this matter of expurgation the Spanish Inquisition took great credit to itself for its liberality, and it certainly spared no labor to preserve the faithful from contamination without absolutely prohibiting books. The *Index Expurgatorius* in its literal sense may be said to be a peculiar Spanish institution. Rome, while issuing repeated revisions of the *Index*

[1] Carta acordada de 21 de Henero de 1627 (MSS. Royal Library of Copenhagen, 218*b* fol. p. 214).

To what extent these commands were obeyed by those who had purchased copies previous to the edict it would be impossible to say without an extended examination of old editions for which I do not possess the requisite material. I have books with expurgated passages, and again others which have escaped the expurgation ordered. Thus in the *Historia Eclesiástica de España*, by the Dominican Padre Juan de Marieta (Cuenca, 1596) my copy shows untouched the cap. 63 of Lib. II. in which the unlucky author speaks of Priscillian and Latrocinianus as two saints, martyred by "Maximian," whose bodies are venerated at Trèves. This attribution of sanctity to men put to death as Manichæans escaped the censors, but the whole chapter was ordered *borrado* by the Inquisition (Index of Sotomayor, 1640, p. 735).

Curiously enough, in this Marieta would seem to have been more accurate than the Church universal. Although Priscillian's name has been in every list of heretics from the time of his death to the present day, the recent discovery of some of his works by Herr Schepss shows that he was the victim of personal enmity and not of misbelief. No one could assert more strongly than he does the dogma of the Trinity or anathematize more heartily Manes, Basilides, and the Ophites. In fact his use of the celebrated text I. John v. 7, perhaps establishes for it a greater antiquity than has been attributed to it through its absence from the Vatican, Alexandrian and Sinaitic codices (Priscilliani quæ supersunt, Vindobonae, 1889, pp. 6, 22–3).

Librorum Prohibitorum, only once attempted an *Index Expurgatorius*, which never was completed; the portion issued was speedily suppressed and has become one of the rarest of books.[1] Thus the "suspension" of a book, as it was tech-

[1] This is the Index of Gianmaria Guanzelli da Brisighella, Master of the Sacred Palace, of which the first volume appeared in Rome in 1607, was reprinted at Bergamo in 1609, and was quietly suppressed in 1611. It was reprinted by the Protestants in 1723 at Regensburg, in 1745 at Altdorf, and in 1837 at Dublin with learned notes by Dr. Gibbings. My copy is the Bergamo edition, bearing on the title-page the inscription of the Congregation of the Oratory of Fossombrone, showing that the order to surrender copies was not strictly obeyed, even by religious bodies.

It is no wonder that the attempt was abandoned, for the labor involved was endless and the result invited criticism. The volume is a 12mo of 599 double-columned pages and only embraces fifty-two authors. If completed it would have been a small library in itself. The second edition of Margarin de la Bigne's *Bibliotheca Sanctorum Patrum*, Paris, 1559, calls for 204 pages of emendations. The *Problemata Francisci Georgii*, Venice, 1536, and his *Harmonia Mundi*, Venice, 1535, occupy 92 pages. Jerome Cardan's *Liber de Subtilitate Rerum* and his *Liber de Varietate Rerum* fill 33 pages, and so on. Many of the emendations are absurdly trivial. It was setting a narrow-minded monk to criticize and cut at his pleasure every expression that offended him, and even to emendate the Fathers when they happened not to agree with the doctrines current at the period.

Besides the unwieldiness of the task there was probably another deterrent reason in the difficulty of formulating expurgations without at times admitting variations of doctrine and affording ground for the sarcastic comments of heretics. See the very remarkable confession, confirmed by the great authority of Árias Montano, prefixed to the expurgation of Bertram's (Ratramnus) work *De Corpore et Sanguine Domini* in the Index Expurg. Antverp. 1571, p. 4. The Tridentine Index had found it more convenient to forbid the work altogether (Index Libb. Prohibb. Antverp. 1570, p. 17). For the controversy which this excited see Gretser (De Jure et More Prohibendi Libros, Ingoldstad. 1603, pp. 326–9), who abuses Ratramnus, suggests that his works have been adulterated by heretics and adduces the condemnation of Tertullian and Origen by Pope Gelasius.

There was a further reason which doubtless was in many cases decisive. When the Sorbonne condemned the Commentary of Charles Du Moulin on the *Édit des petites dattes* and was summoned by the Parlement to point out the objectionable passages the Faculty replied "qu'ils n'ont accoustumé de particulariser les passages des liures qui se trouuent mauvais parceque les calomniateurs trouueront des responses et meschans argumens au contraire"

nically called, *donec corrigatur*, was usually equivalent to prohibition, for the passages to be corrected were not publicly made known, although the author could ascertain them by proper application. Spain did not shrink from the task of framing an *Index Expurgatorius* great as were the difficulties which it involved. The first one was that of Antwerp, in 1571, superintended by Benito Árias Montano, and issued under the authority of the Duke of Alva for the Spanish Netherlands. The next was by the Inquisitor General Quiroga, who followed his prohibitory Index of 1583 with an expurgatory one in 1584. Then the two were combined in the Indexes of Sandoval, 1612, of Zapata, 1632, and of Sotomayor, 1640, which were large folio volumes, increasing to two volumes in that of 1707 by Vidal Marin, and that of 1747 by Francisco Perez de Prado y Cuesta. That in performing this enormous labor the censors felt that they were treating authors with distinguished consideration is shown in a memorial presented about 1625 to Philip IV. by the Licenciado Francisco Murcia de la Llana, the royal *corrector general de libros*. He compares the liberality of Spanish censors, who permit the use of heretic works of value by merely expurgating offensive passages, with the harshness of the Roman Congregation of the Index which, in violation of the Tridentine rule prescribing this practice, brutally prohibits the whole work of an orthodox Spanish writer for a few objectionable passages, without specifying them or giving reasons. Thus the Spanish Inquisition permits the use of copies, expurgated according to its instructions, of the works of such heretics as Paul Fagius, Conrad Gesner, Erasmus, Bonaventura Cornelius Bertram, John Meursius, Isaac Casaubon, Reinerus Reineccius, Theodore Zwinger, Filippo Camerario and others. On the other hand, books which have

(Brodeau, La Vie de Maistre Charles du Molin, Paris, 1654, p. 85). It was much safer to condemn in general terms which admitted of no discussion or defence.

passed the preliminary examination in Spain and circulate freely with the assent of the Inquisition are condemned and prohibited in Rome to the great dishonor of the Spanish name. Thus learned Spaniards are deterred from writing, and the booksellers are heavy losers, for the capital which they invest under the careful home censorship is destroyed: they are afraid longer to take such risks and the art of printing which has been brought to such perfection in Spain is threatened with extinction. The worthy licenciate therefore supplicates Philip to take such action as will lead to a change in the Roman practice.[1] This was not the only source of quarrel between the Spanish and Roman censorships, and we shall have occasion to see how Spain arrogated to herself virtual independence.

It was fortunate for Spanish writers and readers that the Inquisition did not always wholly forbid books on account of objectionable passages, for its benighted *calificadores* were exceedingly sensitive, and a careless phrase was as little likely to escape them as an assertion of justification by faith. In the prohibitory Index of 1583 there appears an Office of the Blessed Virgin, printed in Paris in 1556, which was suppressed

[1] MSS. of the Bodleian Library, Arch Seld. Subt. 11.—This was probably a move in the debate over the *Regalistas*, of which more hereafter.

Murcia, however, does injustice to the Roman censorship in his statement of its methods. Though it failed to issue a list of expurgations, when an author humbly supplicated for a statement of objectionable passages it would be kindly furnished to him and he would be allowed to correct them and to reprint his book, subject to the subsequent approbation of the Congregation.—Catalani de Secretario Congr. Indicis, Romæ, 1751, p, 31.

In the case of the works of Theodore Zwinger, referred to by Murcia, the prohibitory Index of Quiroga, 1583, alludes only to his *Theatrum Vitæ Humanæ*, with *permittitur . . . si repurgetur;* a few expurgations are ordered in the expurgatory Index of 1584, which are vastly increased in Sotomayor, 1640, and his other works are added, occupying pp. 909–34. In the Index of Clement VIII., 1596, his name appears among authors of the first class, all of whose works are condemned; but his *Theatrum* obtains a place in the second class with "nisi corrigatur," and in Brisighelli there is a long list of expurgations for it, extending from p. 573 to p. 593.

and seized by the Supreme Council by a decree of May 15, 1570, because on the title page there was a cross and a swan with the legend "In hoc cygno vinces."[1] In the second part of the *Monte Calvario* of Antonio de Guevara, Bishop of Mondoñedo, there is a single expurgation—"Ishmael was a boy who was only three years old," of which the offensive sense would be hard to discover.[2] Even so orthodox and popular a writer as Cervantes could not wholly escape, although the permanent excision from chapter 36 of the Second Part of Don Quixote, of the words "works of charity negligently performed are of no worth" finds its explanation in the war which the Inquisition was waging against the mystics.[3] As for Dante, the only wonder is that having commenced to expurgate the *Divina Commedia* the censors should have contented themselves with three passages, not more objectionable than many others.[4] The care with which unpalatable facts were kept

[1] Llorente, I. 478.—Reusch, Die Indices, p. 423.

[2] Monte Calvario, P. II. La segunda palabra, cap. xii.—Índice de Sotomayor, p. 67.

[3] Índice de Sotomayor, p. 794.—Índice Último, 1790, p. 51.

[4] Índice de Sotomayor, p. 324. Cf. Índice Último, p. 7.

The first expurgation is the inscription on the tomb of St. Anastasius I. in hell—

Anastagio Papa guardo
Lo qual trasse Fotin della via dritta.—Inferno, XI.

The second is the burst of indignation over the avarice of Boniface VIII., but only that portion of the invective is stricken out which applies to popes in general—

Di voi pastor s'accorde il Vangelisto . . . .
. . . Ahi Costantin di quanto mal fu matre,
Non la tua conversion, ma quella dote
Che da te prese il primo ricco patre!—Inferno, XIX.

And the third is the last seven lines of Paradiso IX.—

A questo intende 'l Papa e i Cardinali:
Non vanno i lor pensieri a Nazzaretti, etc.

In all this the Spaniard was more sensitive than the popes themselves, for the Roman Indexes are silent as to the *Commedia* and only forbid the *Monarchia*, which has been in all of them since the Tridentine.

from the knowledge of the faithful is seen in the expurgation of the *Repúblicas del Mundo* of the learned Fray Jerónimo Roman. In speaking of communion in both elements in the early Church he says "the blood was given to all," and the phrase was *borrado*, while in the statement "Because then they communed sub utra que specie" the words "some persons" are ordered to be inserted in place of "they." Again, in describing a reformation of the clergy he adds "Another one would do no harm"—an expression regarded as dangerous enough to be stricken out.[1] So tender were the inquisitors as to what might be construed as derogatory to the character of a monarch that a decree of 1790, expurgating the *Historia del Real Monasterio de Sixena* by Fray Marco Antonio Varon, orders a phrase stricken out in which the author, alluding to Philip II., says: "When this monarch was despoiling the world to enrich his monastery of the Escorial" as defamatory to the memory of that king, although the book had been printed fourteen years before, with the approbation of the royal examiners.[2] It can readily be imagined under what trammels authorship was pursued when subject to censorship so minute and malicious, yet capable of inflicting so much loss and disgrace.

[1] Índice Expurgatorio de Quiroga, 1584 (Ed. Saumur. fol. 99-100). Garibay in his Memoirs tells us that he examined this work for its preliminary licence and approved it, but that in the press alterations were made which brought it into the Index (Memorial Histórico Español, T. VII. p. 343). In this Garibay is evidently seeking to escape responsibility for his ill-timed liberality, for no author would have ventured to introduce such additions as those expurgated in a work of which the MS. pages had been numbered and the corrections rubricated. Whole chapters are ordered to be excised, together with numerous passages, sometimes extending over several pages. In addition, Llorente tells us (Hist. Critique II. 468) that the author was reprimanded by the Inquisition of Valladolid.

[2] From a copy of the original decree in my possession. The above passage and others are condemned as "detractivos, injuriosos é infamatorios respectivamente de la buena memoria del Señor Rey Don Felipe Segundo, y los reverendos Obispos de Lérida, Don Antonio Agustin y D. Francisco Virgilio, y estar llenos de proposiciones sediciosas, malsonantes y sospechosas de error."

The organization of the Inquisition was so complete, and the terror which it inspired so profound, that the State frequently used its censorship to suppress writings purely political, which one would have supposed the secular authorities amply able to deal with. The Inquisition assumed to itself this function from a passage in the instructions of Clement VIII. ordering the expurgation of matters derogatory to princes and ecclesiastics, and contrary to good morals and Christian discipline.[1] The works of Antonio Perez were thus put upon the Index of 1612 because they were damaging to Philip II., and the essay on the coinage by the Jesuit historian Mariana was suppressed by the Inquisition ostensibly for political reasons.[2] When in 1640 misgovernment provoked the revolt of Catalonia, the authorities of Barcelona addressed a long and temperate manifesto to Philip IV., which the Inquisition promptly seized and ordered to be suppressed, whereupon the Catalans sent a copy to the pope with a request that he would point out in what it concerned the Inquisition.[3] Soon after this the Holy Office gave conclusive evidence of its agility in adapting itself to the mutations of court favor. In November, 1642, it prohibited and burnt a manifesto in which the Catalans accused the royal favorite Olivares of causing all the misfortunes of Spain. Olivares was then tottering to his fall; he was dismissed in January, 1643, and in the following June we find the Inquisition issuing an edict

[1] MSS. Royal Library of Copenhagen, 218*b* fol. p. 322.—Instruct. Clement. PP. VIII. Tit. *De Correctione Librorum.* Cf. Índice de Sotomayor, Regla XVI.

[2] Biblioteca Nacional de Madrid, Seccion de MSS. S. 294, fol. 220.—Índice de Sotomayor, 1640, pp. 67, 718.—Índice Ultimo, 1790, pp. 171, 209.

[3] Cartas de Jesuitas (Memorial Histórico Español, T. XVI. pp. 47, 50). The Jesuit who records the fact speaks of the manifesto with great admiration—"no parece obra de Catalanes sino de angeles del cielo; es papel de grande erudicion y muy conforme á la necessidad del tiempo." It is still prohibited in the Indice Último, p. 218. An abstract of it and of the answer attributed to Rioja may be found in the *Biblioteca de Autores Españoles*, T. XXI. pp. xxx. xxxv.

to be read in all the churches ordering everyone to surrender copies of a pamphlet entitled *Nicandro ó Antidoto*, which had been issued in his defence.[1]

The State found in the Inquisition an equally effective instrument for executing the laws respecting prohibited books —executive business, secular in its nature and easy to be performed by secular officials. As early as 1566 it was made the duty of the inquisitors to visit regularly and inspect all book-shops in order to seize all prohibited books and to see that those ordered to be expurgated were duly corrected. Booksellers moreover were ordered to report to them, under a penalty of fifty ducats and excommunication, all books prohibited or liable to expurgation, which they might observe in private libraries.[2] The business of preventing the importation of heretic books was more difficult, and divided itself into two branches—the supervision of regular importations and the prevention of smuggling. The former was at first confided to the Inquisition, though subsequently, as we shall see, it was undertaken by the State. Commissioners of the Inquisition were stationed at all the ports, who were instructed

[1] Cartas de Jesuitas (T. XVI. p. 381; T. XVII. p. 133).—Pellicer, Avisos históricos (Valladares, Semanario erúdito, T. XXXIII. p. 29). The *Nicandro* remained forbidden till the end (Índice Último, p. 191).

[2] Cartas acordadas, 9 de Ottobre de 1566; 9 de Agosto de 1585; 15 de Henero de 1627 (MSS. Royal Library of Copenhagen, *218b* fol. p. 214).

I have not met with any account of the process of purging the libraries and book-shops of Spain, but it was doubtless performed with thoroughness. When in 1570 Árias Montano framed an Index for the Netherlands, by command of the Duke of Alva, investigation was made of all collections of books and the prohibited ones were removed. He describes this in a letter of May 10, 1570, to Philip II. "El duque d'Alba por servicio de V. Md. me mandó el año pasado hacer un catálogo de los libros que entendiese ser reprobados para repurgar las librerías destos Estados. Yo lo hice, y conforme á él se repurgaron, é yo asistí á la repurgacion de las deste villa [Amberes], y fué Dios servido que se hizo por todas partes bien y sin perjuicio de persona." He also reports progress in the expurgation of the works of St. Augustin, St. Jerome, Tertullian "y otros autores graues" in which were contained "cosas no tan sanas como conviene" (Colleccion de Documentos inéditos, T. XLI. pp. 173, 175).

by a *carta acordada* of 1602 to seize all books by new authors and all new and enlarged editions of old books as soon as they arrived, and to allow no one to see them until they were reported to the Supreme Council of the Inquisition, whose decision was to be awaited. Subsequent instructions of 1628 order the Commissioners to seal the joints of all packages of books; when the duty was paid they were to be deposited with a person of confidence, taking security that he would deliver them to the Supreme Council and not to the owners.[1] It goes without saying that all prohibited books were detained and kept or burnt. Thus the introduction into Spain of even the most innocent literature was discouraged with regulations so cumbrous as to be well-nigh prohibitory.

The surreptitious importation of books was sought to be prevented by an elaborate system of *visitas de navios*, which, when not corruptly evaded, must have been a serious burden on all commerce. This commenced in 1566, in consequence of advices from the Princess of Parma, Governess of Flanders, that the heretics were endeavoring to smuggle their writings into Spain. Accordingly the examination of all ships arriving in Spanish ports was ordered, in search of prohibited books, and fresh zeal was aroused in 1578 by the news that the heretics had printed a Spanish New Testament with the imprint of Venice, for circulation in Spain. Similar notices from the pope and other sources of the shipment of heretic and Jewish books were not infrequent, stimulating to the utmost the watchfulness of the Inquisition, and the numerous instructions issued show how difficult was the task and the importance attached to it. Ships of friendly nations, with which there were commercial treaties, were not exempted; the packages of goods and the water casks, the chests and berths of the officers and crew were all to be sedulously examined, and if any one was found endeavoring to bring in forbidden volumes he was arrested and handed over to the

[1] MSS. Royal Library of Copenhagen, 218*δ*. fol., p. 305.

nearest Inquisition for trial. When heretics came to trade, bringing books for their own use, the commissioner was instructed to examine them and if found to be prohibited to mark them conspicuously and indelibly, so that Catholics could recognize them, warning the owners not to bring them on shore under heavy penalties. In 1597 English ships were directed to be treated with gentleness, so as not to cause offence, and this was repeated in 1631.[1]

Although commerce with the New World was jealously limited to Spanish bottoms, the *visita de navios* was conducted there with special vigilance to guard against the introduction not only of prohibited books but of heretics, and to punish any infractions of the faith committed by the crew or passengers during the voyage. The instructions for this examination are worth transcribing as an illustration of the Spanish methods of preserving the purity of the faith.

I. Firstly, the name of the vessel and of her owner; from what part of Spain or other kingdom did she sail and with what register.

II. *Iten.* How long is it since they left the said port and at what other ports or places have they touched or landed; what other vessels have they met, and with whom have they treated or traded during the voyage.

III. *Iten.* Whether on the said vessel there are any persons, navigating officers, sailors, or passengers, who are foreigners, and come from outside the kingdoms of Spain, particularly from England, Flanders, Germany or France, or other parts suspicious as to the faith, and if such foreigners as left the kingdoms of Spain were put upon the ship's register, or were they picked up afterwards in ports touched at.

IV. *Iten.* What Christian doctrine and prayers of the Church have they recited at sea, and what saints have they besought as advocates and invoked in their necessities and perils.

V. *Iten.* What books have been brought in the vessel from which to recite prayers or for amusement; those which they have must be examined to see whether they are prohibited; if in a

[1] MSS. Royal Library of Copenhagen, 218*b* fol. pp. 199, 231, 304–5.—Biblioteca Nacional de Madrid, Seccion de MSS. S. 294, fol. 48.

foreign tongue great care must be exercised to ascertain what they are. Here it must be observed that if the people are Lutherans they usually bring the Psalms of David which they sing at sea.

VI. *Iten.* What images do they bring, solid, painted, stamped or engraved on paper or cloth. The inscriptions and letters are to be examined to see if they contain false doctrine; if there are no inscriptions, to see whether the pictures are degrading to the saints, as when holy things are mingled with profane; whether they represent the male and female saints decently and reputably, or in the shape of cavaliers and ladies finely attired. To execute Nos. V. and VI. it is necessary to open and examine thoroughly the boxes and chests of the sailors and others.

VII. *Iten.* Whether they know if anyone on board has done or said anything that is or seems to be contrary to our holy faith and the mother Church of Rome, or contrary to any of the seven sacraments, or in any other way contrary thereto.

VIII. *Iten.* And if this question brings a reply, the matter must be examined into, as to time, place, and persons present, interrogating the concurring witnesses according to the instructions issued for that purpose.[1]

In pursuance of a royal *cédula*, the commissioners of the Inquisition were instructed in 1603 to see that no one, not even the royal officials, reached newly arrived ships before them; all might go together, but the Inquisition must not be second. Only one guard was to be kept on board during the vessel's stay in port, to represent all three jurisdictions—local, royal, and inquisitorial—and each in turn was to have the privilege of his appointment.[2] In the incurable jealousy which prevailed between the secular officials and those of the Inquisition it was to be expected that these competing rights

[1] MSS. of David Fergusson, Esq.—From the allusion to Lutherans I presume that this formula is adapted from one in use throughout the Spanish dominions.

Among Mr. Fergusson's MS. is the examination at Vera Cruz, October 31, 1600, of Gerónimo Nuñez, master of the ship María de San Vicente, just arrived from Cadiz, showing that these instructions were strictly followed.

[2] MSS. Royal Library of Copenhagen, 218*b* fol. pp. 231, 305.—Biblioteca Nacional de Madrid, Seccion de MSS. S. 294, fol. 48.

should cause frequent collisions. In 1628 a quarrel thus arising between the inquisitorial and royal representatives at the port of San Sebastian led to a withdrawal of the royal cédula of 1603 and the substitution of a rule that either might precede the other.[1] That this failed to bring peace is seen in a complaint addressed, August 16, 1647, to the Inquisition of Granada by its commissioner at Malaga, Doctor Don Diego de Vargas y de la Zerda. The *veedor* of the port, Don Pedro de Funes, had proclaimed publicly that the king commanded him to make the first visit and had forcibly prevented the commissioner from using the boat in which the visits were made. Then the commissioner bought a boat and adorned it with the standard of the Inquisition, which provoked fresh outrages—possibly owing to his paying the wages of his three boatmen by allowing them the use of the boat at night and permitting them to carry merchants to the ships for trade. Against this charge he alleges the evil deeds of another of his enemies, the chief of the custom house, who winked at the landing by night of heretic books and of merchandize without paying duty. One singularly barefaced complaint is that the royal officials notified the ship-captains that they need not give him the customary *propina* or entertainment, in consequence of which on recently visiting three Hamburg vessels he received from one only a fragment of rotten cheese and from the others nothing. The good doctor's appeal was promptly answered by the Inquisition of Granada on August 20. He could keep his boat, it told him, but it must be used for his official visits and not for any illegal purposes. The first visit could be made by the one who first reached the ship, and the others must not make trouble; anyone interfering with him was liable to the fine of 200 ducats, which for inferior persons was to be reduced to twenty.[2]

It shows the incurable disorder and corruption of the whole

[1] Biblioteca Nacional de Madrid, Seccion de MSS. S. 294, fol. 48.

[2] Ibid. fol. 132.

system that no notice was taken of the commissioner's complaint about his *propinas*. A *carta acordada* of 1604 positively prohibits all officials employed in visiting ships from receiving collations or artillery salutes, or from placing guards on board, and one of 1670 alludes to thirteen silver reals as the fee which they are entitled to charge. Another order, issued in 1606, points to a further abuse in prohibiting them from taking with them notaries and familiars who are traders and from buying and selling during the visit.[1] How little these rules were observed and how the whole business was converted into a matter of illicit gain and extortion is shown by a memorial, without date, describing the ordinary routine in the port of Cadiz, and suggesting reforms. We are told that as soon as a ship comes to anchor in the Bay, the guard of the Holy Office notifies the interpreter, who makes preparation for the visit and notifies the commissioner. The visit may be made in either of two ways—on board the ship or in the commissioner's office. If the former, a boat is hired for sixteen reals, which the shipmaster has to pay, as well as fees of four reals for the commissioner, four for the alguacil, four for the notary, four for the guard, two for each familiar of whom there will be at least two, four for the interpreter, and whatever can be extorted for the carpet which is placed in the boat—enough having been paid for this carpet to cover the whole Bay of Cadiz with an awning. The master is required to receive the visitors with a salute of three pieces of artillery and it is customary to accompany this with abundant libations of beer. The commissioner proceeds to the cabin, where a collation is served to him and his followers, who drink freely; his officials are mostly merchants who thus learn what merchandize the vessel brings and have chances to purchase to advantage. Meanwhile the guard is sent to examine the chests of the sailors; if he finds books he brings

[1] MSS. Royal Library of Copenhagen, 218*b* fol. p. 305.—Biblioteca Nacional, Seccion de MSS. S. 294, fol. 48.

them to the commissioner; the interpreter pronounces them books of devotion and they are returned; there is no pretence of examining the cargo, which is a physical impossibility. When, as sometimes happens, there are twenty ships to be visited in an afternoon, there are orgies which it would be indecent to describe, though in such cases the collations are often commuted for money, giving rise to numberless extortions.

When the so-called visit is made at the commissioner's office, the shipmaster comes there; he is asked the customary questions, and whether he brings books or images prohibited by the Inquisition; he is warned that he and his crew must not talk about religion, or they will be punished, and all this is duly entered on the register. Then he is required to pay all the fees enumerated above, including the boat and the carpet, and in addition a commutation for the powder which would have been used in the salute, and some provisions—hams, cheese, butter or other merchandize—which he is expected to bring in lieu of the collation. There is no check whatever upon the introduction of heretic books, and all that the Inquisition gains is that it is commonly known among mariners not as the *Santo Oficio* but as the *Santo Ladronicio*. The memorial winds up with the sensible suggestion—too sensible and economical to be adopted—that all these indecent excesses would be avoided and the real object would be obtained, if the Inquisition would station at the custom house a trustworthy official to be present when packages were opened and detain for submission to the tribunal anything that seemed suspicious.[1] The object of the Holy Office was not to reduce the exactions of its ministers, but to increase them. In 1641 the Inquisition of Logroño created at San Sebastian the office of alguacil mayor and sold it to Domingo de Orendayen, who had been its notary and familiar. The town at once appealed to Philip IV. against the creation of a

[1] Biblioteca Nacional, Seccion de MSS. S. 294, fol. 50. (*See Appendix.*)

new office with its prospective fees as an additional burden upon the commerce of the port, but the Inquisition prevailed, and Orendayen was authorized to exact a fee of six reals for each visit to a ship.[1]

I have not happened to meet with any special detailed instructions as to the routine observed at points of entry on the land frontier, but occasional allusions show that similar vigilance was prescribed there. In 1557, Carranza, the future Archbishop of Toledo, while in Flanders discovered the route by which heretics sent their books to Spain. The ports being closed to them they were carried over the mountains of Jaca, whereupon orders were at once sent to the Inquisitions of Saragossa and Calahorra to intercept them.[2]

LICENCES FOR READERS.

While some books were so obnoxious that their possession and perusal were absolutely forbidden to everyone, in general it was admitted that most of those entered on the Index could be read without danger by learned and discreet men. It is not to be supposed that the cultured classes submitted cheerfully to the deprivation of so large a portion of the current literature of the day—the excluded portion being precisely that which most provoked curiosity and stimulated thought—and in the revolutionary period of the sixteenth century it was not expedient to arouse unnecessary discontent and insubordination. Besides, if the assaults of the heretics were to be repulsed and their dogmas overthrown it was requisite that controversialists should have access to their books to refute them. At an early period, therefore, in the organization of censorship, it became customary to issue licences to individuals authorizing them to hold and read prohibited books.

[1] Bibliotheca Nacional, Seccion de MSS. S. 294, fol. 48.

[2] Menendez y Pelayo, II. 366.

The power to grant such a privilege was a valuable one; it was liable to abuse, and in the existing condition of public morals, in both Church and State, abuses were sure to creep in wherever there was an opening for them. The prohibition to read condemned books embraced all classes, from emperors, kings, and cardinals down, and there was money or money's worth in the authority to grant exemptions from it. Bishops, indeed, assumed that their office conferred on them the privilege to read heretic books, but Peña assures us that in this they were mistaken. Inquisitors claimed the same right, and as, in Spain at least, the business of prohibition was in their hands, they made good the claim, not only for themselves but for their commissioners, provided that in issuing the commission they included the power.[1]

As early as 1550 Julius III. proclaimed that the licensing of learned men to read heretical books for the purpose of confuting them had not produced the benefits expected, but rather had occasioned certain inconveniences—inconveniences which Paul IV. did not scruple to admit were that the learned controversialists instead of silencing the heretics were apt to be themselves seduced into heresy. For this reason Julius withdrew all licences, no matter to whom granted, even if they had been issued by popes, and in future only inquisitors and their commissioners were to have the privilege of reading prohibited books. Having thus cleared the field of licences, there naturally sprang up a fresh market for them, which was met by a new issue, and by 1558 these had grown so numerous that Paul IV. was induced to abrogate them again, this time confining for the future to inquisitors general the right to read the forbidden literature.[2]

[1] Pegnæ Comment. ad Eymeric. p. 91.

[2] Septimi Decretal. Lib. V. Tit. iv. c. 2, 4.—The gratulation with which Alfonso de Castro welcomed the bull of Julius III. shows the importance attached to it as a vigorous move in the war against heresy. – De justa Hæret. Punit. Lib. II. c. xvii.

Florimond de Rémond (Synopsis Controversiarum Lib. IV. cap. ii. § 6)

This process of issuing papal licences and then withdrawing them was frequently repeated, doubtless to the advantage of the officials concerned in supplying them, but we need not pursue further the eccentricities of the Roman curia. Spain was ever a law unto herself, and although the Inquisitor General Valdés based the authority of his Index of 1559 on the bull of Paul IV. of 1558, the Spanish Inquisition speedily arrogated to itself complete autonomy in the matter of licences. Those issued in Rome were treated as invalid in Spain,[1] and the authority of the Inquisition was too generally dreaded for any one to venture to test the question. The inquisitor general alone was recognized as possessing the right to grant them within his jurisdiction, and those which he granted were held not to be subject to cancellation by the papal authority. When Gregory XV. in 1622 withdrew and cancelled all licences, and when Urban VIII. in 1631 repeated the withdrawal, excepting those issued personally by himself, the Spanish Inquisition formally declared that it was not the intent of the pope to interfere with the powers of the inquisitor general, whose licences were therefore still regarded as valid.[2]

gives us a transcript of one issued to him, March 11, 1619, by the Congregation of the Inquisition. He had much trouble in obtaining it, though he was already known as a vigorous Catholic controversialist, and it was only granted through the intervention of Cardinal Gioioso, who personally vouched for him. From its terms there was evidently no settled form of printed blank, but it was made out to suit the special case. He was required to read the forbidden books secretly and not let them be seen by others; he was to exhibit the licence and all books procured under it to the Ordinary of Bordeaux, where he lived; it ran only for three years, at the expiration of which he was to surrender it and the books to the Ordinary, or if he died meanwhile his heirs were to do so, in order that they might be burnt forthwith.

[1] Llorente, I. 492.

[2] Mag Bullar. Roman. III. 493; V. 220.—MSS. Royal Library of Copenhagen, 218*b* fol. p. 332.

Towards the close of the sixteenth century Peña holds (Comment. ad Eymeric. p. 92) that the right claimed by inquisitors to issue licences had no foundation and that it was reserved for the pope alone. Cf. Farinacci de Hæres. Quæst. 180, No. 36, 37.—Alberghini tells us that under a bull of

Llorente tells us that the Spanish Inquisition issued these licences very sparingly ; that the applicant's life and character were closely investigated, that he was obliged to specify the description of books wanted and his object, and that when granted the licence only covered a definite number of books on a designated subject. One class of literature was always excepted, and no licence carried permission to read it—books directly opposed to Catholicism, including such works as those of Rousseau, Montesquieu, Mirabeau, Didérot, d'Alembert, Voltaire and even Filangieri.[1] It evidently was no easy matter to procure licences in 1664, for a letter of that date from the Licentiate Juan Lúcas Cortés to the bibliographer Nicolás Antonio reminds him of a previous request to obtain one for him and urges it as a matter of much importance to him. Cortés at that time was in confidential government employment in Madrid, and yet evidently felt it useless to make the attempt himself—but when he adds that it will quiet his conscience one is disposed to think that he had already yielded to temptation.[2] Probably the rigor with regard to the matter varied with the temper of the inquisitor general, and doubtless there were times in which they were more largely issued and more liberally construed. In 1720 the Inquisitor General Astorga y Céspedes withdrew all outstanding licences on the ground of the general disregard of the prohibitions of the Inquisition.[3] They must however have been speedily reissued with a liberal hand, for in the catalogue of publications of Pedro Joseph Alonzo y Padilla, *Librero de Cámara de su Magestad*, issued in 1737, consisting of works of light literature, "para divertir la ociosidad" various works appear with the cautionary notice "Está prohibido." These are "Arrestos de Amor por el Secretario Diego Gracian," "Carcel

Paul V. this power was conferred on the Spanish inquisitor general (Manuale Qualificatorum, Cæsaraugustæ, 1671, p. 132). That this was so we shall see hereafter.

[1] Llorente, I. 492.

[2] Ochoa, Epistolario Español, Madrid, 1870, T. II. p. 113.

[3] Recited in an edict of February 13, 1747 (MSS. of David Fergusson, Esq.).

de Amor y Question de Amor," "Carnestolendas de Castilla," "Entretenimientos de Damas y Galantes," and "Selvas de Aventuras." Now some of these, at least, were not the fugitive literature of the day. The *Carcel de Amor* and the *Question de Amor* were classics, the former first printed in 1492 and the latter in 1512.[1] Alonzo y Padilla must have obtained a licence for printing them, although prohibited, and he would not have printed them or have kept all these prohibited books on his list had there not been a public enjoying licences large enough to warrant the investment of capital. In fact, the cautionary notice affixed to the books was doubtless a good advertisement for them.

This is partly confirmed by the Inquisitor General, Prado y Cuesta, who in 1747 tells us that there was a general clamor among thoughtful men against the abuse of licences and that on investigation he found that they were not sought by men of learning but by the frivolous of both sexes to gratify an idle or an evil curiosity. Many persons, he says, contented themselves with verbally asking leave to read a single book and pretended to mistake a polite refusal, or extended the permission to as many books as they wished. Others, seeing ignorant persons licensed, think the liberty general and do not even make application for it. He therefore revokes all that had been granted by himself or his predecessors and requires the delivery within fifteen days to the Inquisition of all prohibited and suspended books, under penalty of excommunication *latæ sententiæ* and a fine of two hundred ducats.[2]

To the end the Spanish Inquisition continued to assert its independence of Rome in the matter of licences and its claims were virtually acquiesced in. In 1770 the "Society

[1] Ticknor's Spanish Literature, I. 384. Neither of these works appear in the Indexes of 1559 and 1583, but they are both in that of 1640 (pp. 323, 864). Menendez y Pelayo tells us (Heterodoxos Españoles, II. 708) that the principal reason for prohibiting the *Carcel* was that the hero commits suicide, which illustrates the tragi-comic sensitiveness of the Spanish censorship.

[2] Edicto de 13 de Henero de 1747 (MSS. of David Fergusson, Esq.).

of the Friends of Spain" applied to Clement XIV. for permission to possess and read the *Dictionnaire Encyclopédique*. Clement did not venture to decide the question himself, but wrote to the Inquisitor General Manuel Quintano Bonifaz, referring the matter to him. He took the opportunity however to assume supremacy, by expressing full confidence in the piety, zeal and wisdom of Bonifaz and empowering him to grant the request to such members of the Society as were free from suspicion of danger by reason of their age, morals, learning, and known zeal for the faith. What was the result of the affair does not appear, but the Society had probably no reason to congratulate itself on the result of the forbidden appeal from Madrid to Rome.[1]

INDEPENDENCE OF ROME.

If any definition of faith or morals by the Vicar of Christ was entitled to unquestioning obedience by all the faithful it would seem to be that embodied in the decision as to whether a book is orthodox and fitted for perusal; and yet, outside of a portion of Italy, the papal decrees on the subject received

[1] Bullar. Roman. Contin., Prati, 1847, T. V. p. 174. Didérot's *Dictionnaire Encyclopédique* was condemned in Rome by decree of September 3, 1759 (Index Leonis XIII. p. 104), and in Madrid, October 9, 1759 (Índice Último, p. 88). The latter states that at the time (1790) they were at work, by order of the Supreme Council, on the expurgation of the new edition then appearing in Paris. Of this a translation was projected, the list of subscribers to which was headed by the inquisitor general himself. When the *Nouvelle Encyclopédie par ordre de matières* appeared in Paris a translation was commenced, but unluckily the article *Espagne* proved exceedingly distasteful. The Spanish Government made reclamations on the French Republic, which sharply reprimanded the author, the censor and the printer. In Spain the sale was suspended, and finally the Inquisition interposed and seized all the stock on hand. Panckouke's Madrid agent was ruined and Panckouke himself suffered severe losses.—Bourgoing, Tableau d'Espagne, I. 300 (Paris, 1803).

scant obedience, and least of all, we may say, in Spain, the most orthodox of lands. When in 1559 Paul IV. issued the first Roman Index, Benito Árias Montano informs us that it excited the indignation of all scholars; that in France and in the greater part of Italy it was not obeyed and that in Spain it was not even suffered to be published.[1] Valdés, the inquisitor general, contented himself with announcing that catalogues of prohibited books had been issued in Rome, Louvain and Portugal and that the Inquisition would combine them and promulgate a new one.[2] The promised Index speedily appeared and showed that it was framed with little respect for papal decisions; books prohibited in Rome were permitted in Spain.[3] After the death of Paul there was less rigidity in Rome, and then Valdés refused to respond to this liberality. The Roman inquisitor general, Michele Ghislerio (afterwards St. Pius V.), sent to Spain an edict announcing the striking off from the Index of certain books by order of Pius IV. and permitting the reading of works free from heresy —works on medicine, science, grammar and other indifferent matters, prohibited only because written by heretics, also anonymous books and vernacular Bibles. Valdés however

1 Villanueva, de la Leccion de la Sagrada Escritura, p. 29.

2 Llorente, I. 470.

3 In 1560 Lorenzo Palmireno, in a work on the Rhetoric of Cicero, alludes to the Commentaries on Cicero by Xistus Bethulius being prohibited by the pope, while the Spanish Inquisition only condemned his edition of the De Officiis, and he is warm in his gratitude for the greater liberality shown in Spain—"Dios le dé mucha vida al inquisidor mayor que ha sido en esse y otros libros mas liberal con los estudiosos que no el Papa; porque si los Adagios de Erasmo nos quitáran como el Papa queria en su catálogo bien teniamos que sudar" (Adolfo de Castro, Protestantes Españoles, p. 56). Xistus Bethulius is ranked in the first class of the Index of Paul IV., all of his works being prohibited (Reusch, Der Index, I. 264); he is absent from the 1559 Index of Valdés, but all his works are prohibited in that of Quiroga, 1583 (Reusch, Die Indices, p. 431). As for the Adagia, Valdés only permits that work in the expurgated Aldine edition (Reusch, Die Indices, p. 259), which is more liberal than Paul IV. who forbade all the works of Erasmus (Ib. p. 183); but this was relaxed in the Tridentine Index of 1564, which permitted the Aldine Adagia (Ib. p. 259).

suspended the publication of this decree and remonstrated with Philip II. against permitting currency to this papal liberality.[1]

When in 1562 the reassembled Council of Trent took up the whole subject to make laws binding on all Christendom, Philip II. wrote earnestly to the Count de Luna, his ambassador at Trent, and to Vargas, his agent at Rome, to prevent the Tridentine Commission from attempting to include Spain in its regulations. Spain, he urged, had her own Index and her own laws of censorship; no rules could be universal, for a book might be innocent in one place and dangerous in another.[2] He obtained no formal exemption of his dominions from the Tridentine rules, but this made no difference, and Spain continued to act with the utmost independence.[3] The Tridentine Rules and Index, in fact, were not adopted by the Council, but in the hurry of the final session were referred to the pope, under whose authority they were revised and published.[4] They had thus only the weight of papal decrees, and these in Spain were received or rejected as suited the policy of the monarch. In 1514, at the suggestion of Cardinal Ximenes, Ferdinand had ordered that no papal bull or rescript should be published without preliminary examination and the royal approval.[5] In 1572 Philip II. went still further and decreed that all papal briefs procured for use in cases before ecclesiastical courts should be thrown aside, and that

[1] Llorente, I. 471.

[2] Reusch, Der Index, I. 318.

[3] Mendham (Account of the Indexes, London, 1826, p. 94) assumes that with the Index of Sandoval in 1612 the Spanish inquisitors asserted the right of issuing Indexes under their own name and authority (Cf. Llorente, I. 479), but there is virtually no difference between the edict prefixed to the Index of Quiroga in 1583 and that of Sotomayor in 1640. That of Valdés in 1559 had been based on papal authority, and the change is significant.

Concil. Trident Sess. xxv. Contin.—How slender was the respect paid to the prohibitions of the Tridentine Index may be seen by the remarks of the Antwerp Expurgatory Index of 1571 (p. 7) by Árias Montano on its condemnation of Reuchlin's *Speculum Oculare*.

[4] MSS. Royal Library of Copenhagen, 216 fol.

no Spaniard should be cited to appear outside of Spain, thus at a single blow annihilating the time-honored and profitable jurisdiction of the Holy See in matters that for centuries had been within its competence.[1] In 1582 he prohibited the publication of the bull *In Cœna Domini* and expelled the papal nuncio for attempting it.[2] It became the routine that all papal letters sent to Spain were referred, for inspection and consideration, to that department of state which they affected —those which seemed to threaten the *regalías* (royal prerogatives) or the oppression of subjects to the Concejo de Castilla or Royal Council; those relating to the Colonies to the Council of the Indies; those bearing upon indulgences and dispensations to the Commissioner General of the Santa Cruzada, and those tribunals permitted the publication of none which prejudiced the rights of the sovereign or of his subjects. Condemnations of books were of two kinds: the ordinary ones emanated from the Congregation of the Index or from the Congregation of the Roman Inquisition, but in rare instances they were issued directly by the pope. The latter, as entitled to special respect, were submitted to the king, not for the purpose of examining the correctness of the prohibitions, but to see that they contained nothing prejudicial to the commonwealth.[3] The former were sent to the Supreme Council of the Inquisition, which treated them simply as advisory and not as commands. Although the decrees of the Congregations were formally submitted to the pope and approved by him, and derived all their authority from him, the Spanish Inquisition claimed that it owed obedience solely to him and not to the Congregations. Therefore when such a condemnation of a book was laid before the Supreme Council, it quietly proceeded to a new *calificacion* or examination of the work, and if satisfied that it was inju-

[1] Autos Acordados, Lib. I. Tit. viii. Auto 3.

[2] Cabrera, Historia de Felipe II. Lib. XIII. cap. xii.

[3] MSS. Royal Library of Copenhagen, 216 fol.

rious condemned it of its own authority. The papal nuncio was strictly prohibited from distributing such briefs to the bishops, or from publishing them in any way. Occasionally the nuncio sought to evade this by causing the brief to be posted in the court-yard of his palace, but the Supreme Council promptly annulled the act, punished the subordinates who did it, and reported the matter to the king that he might warn the nuncio to observe the laws. Thus the condemnation of a book in Rome carried no weight in Spain, unless it was independently approved by the Inquisition, and many works were current in Spain which were prohibited in Italy, while others were prohibited in Spain and current in Italy. As an incident of this autonomy, when the Inquisition had undertaken the original examination of a book it forbade any appeal to Rome or any attempt to refer the matter there.[1]

[1] MSS. Royal Library of Copenhagen, 218*b* fol. pp. 331, 332. Cf. Van Espen, Juris Ecclesiastici P. I. Tit. xxii. c. iv. §§ 34, 35.—Sicily, as part of the Spanish dominions, was likewise independent of the Roman censorship.

When Salgado's work on the *Regalías* was prohibited in Rome in 1628, Philip IV. asserted the independence of the Spanish Inquisition in the most absolute terms—"Ningun ministro eclesiástico ni otro alguno puede publicar en mis regnos edicto alguno que toque á la fé y lo dependiente de ella, como lo es en parte la prohibicion de libros heréticos y de dañada doctrina, que la Inquisicion sola, por costumbre antiquísima, prohibe, á quien toca privativamente."—Menendez y Pelayo, III. 853.

Philip II. had manifested the same spirit when he offered Charles Du Moulin the place of first professor of law at Louvain with a salary of 2000 livres, after Du Moulin had been condemned by the Holy See for his Commentary on the edict of Henry II. known as the *Édit des petites dattes*, limiting the papal exactions in France. It was to this book that the Constable Montmorenci referred when in presenting the author to the king he said: "Sire, ce que vostre Majesté n'a peu faire et executer auec trente mille hommes, de contraindre le Pape Jules à luy demander la paix, ce petit homme l'a achevé auec un petit livret."—Brodeau, Vie de Maistre Ch. du Molin, Paris, 1654, pp. 74, 78, 86, 120.

The book itself (Commentarius ad Edictum Henrici II. contra parvas Datas et abusus Curiæ Romanæ, Lugduni, 1552) is simply an assertion of the independent authority of the State, as deduced from the imperial and Carlovingian legislation—a commonplace now to all historical students, but at that time a revolt against the glossators, whose ingenious cobwebs it pitilessly swept aside. As such, it was in the highest degree damaging to the Holy See.

In this assertion of independence the Spanish Inquisition was fairly justified by the extraordinary grants of power made to it by successive popes. After Paul III. had in 1542 organized the Roman Inquisition, he issued in 1544 letters declaring that this was in no way to interfere with the powers and jurisdiction of the Spanish Holy Office. In 1551 Julius III. confirmed this and delegated to it all his powers in everything within its sphere of action, which was confirmed by Gregory XIII. in 1572, immediately after St. Pius V. had in 1571 instituted the Congregation of the Index. When in 1587 Sixtus V. remodelled the fifteen congregations he was careful to state that he in no way proposed to infringe on the powers of the Spanish Inquisition and that if anyone should obtain letters from the curia interfering with it in the matter of the censure of books or anything else, they should be regarded as surreptitious unless the derogation was expressly set forth. Clement VIII., in 1595, specially committed to the inquisitor general of Spain cognizance in the matter of prohibiting books, and in 1596 and 1599 he further confirmed all the acts of his predecessors in the premises.[1]

In spite of this array of papal briefs the independence of the Spanish Inquisition was by no means admitted in Rome. Catalani, the secretary of the Congregation of the Index, acknowledges the fact that books approved in Rome were sometimes condemned in Spain, as in the celebrated case of Cardinal Noris's *Historia Pelagiana*, but he protests his ignorance of any right to do so. The further pretension to approve of books condemned in Rome was more serious; Théophile Raynaud had alleged it in defence of his fellow Jesuits, Padres Poza and Manuel Sa, but Catalani pronounces

[1] Salgado, Tractatus de Supplicatione ad Sanctissimum a Literis et Bullis Apostolicis, P. II. c xxxii. No. 87–93.

Sometimes it appears that the decrees of the Congregation of the Index were disregarded on the plea that there was no evidence of their genuineness, as was done by Valenzuela Velasquez, Archbishop of Granada, with a decree of April 26, 1621.—Salgado, P. II. c. xxx. § 5, No. 6.

it ridiculous to suppose that anyone could confer on the Spanish Inquisition the power to rescind the judgments of Rome. In support of this he cites the reply made, December 4, 1674, by the Congregation of the Index to the Bishop of Malaga, who had asked whether the decrees of the Congregation were binding in Spain, and whether bishops could proceed against those who disregarded them. The Congregation assured him that its decrees were binding on all Christians and that bishops could, in virtue of their episcopal authority, punish all transgressors.[1] It is to be hoped that the good bishop did not attempt to exercise his jurisdiction on this basis, for the Inquisition had an awkward way of vindicating its supremacy.

Of course these conflicting claims gave rise to occasional quarrels, some of which are among the curiosities of literary history. One of the most intricate of these concerns the Jesuit Mateo Moya, who, under the pseudonym of Amadæus Guimenius, published at Palermo in 1657, a work in defence of the fashionable Jesuit casuistry, probably called forth by Pascal's *Lettres Provinciales*. Seven years later he enlarged and reissued it under the title of *Opusculum singularia universæ fere theologiæ moralis complectens*, in which he endeavored to show that opinions condemned as those of Jesuits had been entertained by ancient theologians. He prefixed to it an approbation purporting to be issued by Padre Luisius, Provincial of the Capuchin province of the Blood of Christ, in Valencia, which stirred Frère Nicholas, Capuchin Provincial of Paris, to publish, under authority of the General of the Order, a declaration that both Padre Luisius and the Province of the Blood of Christ were mythical creations. Promptly in 1665 the Sorbonne denounced the book as a horrible anti-gospel for the investigation of the filthiest matters with obscene curiosity, and its author as the defender, not so much of the casuists as of all nastiness and

[1] Catalani de Secretario Congr. Indicis, pp. 30, 31, 52.—For the case of Cardinal Noris see Reusch, Der Index, II. 671.

wickedness. The propositions extracted from the work to justify this condemnation show it to be casuistry run mad; it argues away the rites of the Church and the prohibitions of crime and immorality, and virtually destroys the foundations of human society. Among these propositions however were some affirming papal infallibility in faith and morals and the condemnation of these by the Sorbonne brought to the rescue Alexander VII. who in a brief of April 6, 1665, addressed to Louis XIV., asked him to annul the censures. Louis referred the matter to his Parlement which rendered an *arrêt* denouncing infallibility and sustaining the Sorbonne. Thereupon Alexander condemned the decree of the Sorbonne, June 25, 1665, and placed it on the Index where it still remains, but he was careful to explain that he did not wish to defend the scoundrel who had written the book; and to justify himself he referred it to the Congregation of the Inquisition for condemnation. Jesuit influence however was strong in Rome and the Congregation after debate decided that it would be unjust to condemn an author who had only compiled the opinions of Diana, Caramuel and other theologians. Then Alexander had recourse to the Congregation of the Index which possessed independent concurrent jurisdiction over literature, and from its Dominican preponderance was antagonistic to Jesuitism. The Jesuit General Oliva found his efforts baffled and the book was condemned, April 10, 1666. Father Moya addressed to the Congregation a supplication in which he stated that the Spanish Inquisition had approved the book in 1658, and that in a revised edition he would correct and note the condemned propositions. In effect, he issued at Madrid, in 1670, over his own name, a work under the title *Quæstiones selectæ ex præcipuis theologiæ moralis tractatibus*, in which he reprinted part of the *Opusculum*. He enjoyed high favor at the Spanish court, where he was confessor to the Queen-regent, and as such was a member of the royal council, until Carlos II. in 1677 emancipated himself from his mother's authority,

driving her and her confessor from Madrid and banishing her prime minister, Valenzuela, to the Philippines. Possibly this may have emboldened the Holy See to further action, for the *Opusculum* enjoyed the distinction of a second condemnation of the most emphatic kind, when, in 1680, Innocent XI. issued a special brief reciting that in spite of previous prohibitions there were persons who continued to keep and read the work, wherefore he again condemned both the editions of 1657 and 1664, and ordered, under pain of excommunication, removable only by the pope, all copies whether in print or MS. to be delivered to the bishops and to be promptly burnt. In spite of this, which was a formal papal bull and not merely a decree of the Congregations, the Spanish Inquisition held good, and Moya's works were never placed on its Index.[1]

Another struggle, which attracted much attention in its day, occurred over the works of the Jesuit Juan Bautista Poza. In 1626 he published a book entitled *Elucidarium Deiparæ*, of which the extravagance of Mariolatry was in advance of the age. It was promptly condemned by the Congregation of the Index in a decree of April 12, 1628.[2] So far from submitting humbly as was his duty, Poza wrote two audacious letters to Urban VIII. arguing that, in violation of human and divine law, his book had been condemned without hearing the author or consulting the Spanish Inquisition; he asked that the censors be required to state their reasons in writing, adding that if they objected it would show that they had no confidence in their own sentence; the cardinals were too

[1] La Morale des Jesuistes justement condamnée dans le Livre du P. Moya, Liége, 1681.—Van Espen, Juris Ecclesiast. P. I. Tit. xxii. c. 4, § 33.—D'Argentré, Coll. Judic. de novis Erroribus, III. I. 106–133; II. 353.—Reusch, Der Index, II. 499–501.—Le Tellier, Recueil des Bulles concernans les Erreurs, etc., Mons (Rouen), 1797, p. 286.—Index Innoc. XI. 1681, p. 42.—Index Benedict XIV. 1758, p. 51.—Index Leonis XIII., 1887, pp. 59, 143.—Coleccion de Documentos inéditos, T. LXVII. p. 93.

[2] Elenchus Libb. Prohibb., Romæ, 1632, p. 189.—Librorum post Indicem Clement. VIII. Decreta, Romæ, 1624, p. 173.

pressingly occupied in other business to give heed to censorship, which they abandoned to the consultors, some of whom were ignorant and all intriguing and venal, betraying men to their enemies and smirching the reputation of Catholic writers; the books of a Spanish author should not be condemned after they had been approved by the Spanish Inquisitions and the Roman Congregations had no jurisdiction in the Spanish dominions, where the Spanish Inquisition was independent and supreme.[1] These utterances, which manifest so boldly the separatist tendencies of the Spanish Church of the period, were not calculated to make his peace in Rome, and the Congregation, in 1632, retorted with a sweeping decree condemning not only all his works but everything written in defence of the *Elucidarium*.[2] The Spanish Jesuits were thoroughly united in his support; they did not hesitate to say that the books of their members were condemned in Rome through the enmity of the Dominicans who controlled the Index, to which the Dominicans retorted that the faith was in danger if the judgments of the Holy See were to be nullified by arguments precisely similar to those of the heretics.[3] It suited the policy of Olivares to support the Jesuits, and although Sotomayor, the inquisitor general, was a Dominican he was obliged to submit to the all-powerful favorite. How completely the state espoused the Jesuit quarrel is seen in the incident that in Milan the Infante Fernando in 1634 imprisoned one of his servants whom he found copying a Latin attack on Poza and sent the paper to Madrid, where the Jesuits declared that all hell united could not say such shocking things.[4]

The papal nuncio in Madrid in vain endeavored to have the Roman condemnation published. The Inquisition as

[1] Catalani de Secretario Congr. Indicis, pp. 41, 52, 63.—Gibbings, Reprint of the Roman Index Expurgatorius, Dublin, 1837, p. lxiii.

[2] Index Alexand. VII. Index Decretorum No. 36.

[3] Catalani, p. 29.

[4] Cartas de Jesuitas (Memorial Histórico Español, T. XIII. p. 14).

usual undertook its own *calificacion*, and though the majority of its censors disapproved of the *Elucidarium* it was not condemned and Poza's name does not appear in the Index of Zapata in 1632.[1] Yet the open defiance with which he had treated the Holy See could not be passed over in silence. The nuncio continued to press the matter on the Inquisition, and in this he was assisted by Doctor Juan de Espino, a hot-headed ex-Carmelite, who with marvellous constancy passed his time when out of prison in attacking the Jesuits and Poza in particular. At length, in August 1635, a decree was issued that the Inquisition should try him. The affair proceeded slowly, and in March, 1637, we hear of a sentence being agreed upon but not rendered, while Poza was at liberty and lecturing as usual. A year later, in April, 1638, he was in the easy prison of the Hospital of Santiago, in Toledo, where Espino chanced to meet him. The enemies did not know each other and conversed pleasantly till a remark of Poza's caused Espino to retort "That could only be said by a heretic like Poza" whereupon Poza thrashed him soundly. In November of the same year the Inquisition acquitted him, discharged him from all censures, restored him to all his offices and functions and even appointed him reviser general of books for the Holy Office, thus boldly challenging the indignation of the curia.[2] In his capacity of reviser Poza must have had a hand in the compilation of the Index of Sotomayor, which appeared in 1640, but his triumph was transitory. Probably his exultation led him to fresh extravagances which involved him in renewed trouble. His books are not in the Index of 1640, but they must have been under consideration, for, March 27 of that year, a Jesuit writes that he had inquired about them and had been told that in a month they would be in the *Expurgatorio*. This was verified, for soon afterward a Supplement appeared in which they

[1] Reusch, Der Index, II. 436-8.

[2] Cartas de Jesuitas (Memorial, T. XIII. p. 231; T. XIV. pp. 74, 397; T. XV. p. 112).

were included—prohibited until expurgated, and the expurgations ordered in the *Elucidarium* indicate how crazily indecent were the speculations in which Poza indulged.[1] Palafox, indeed, says that the Inquisition ordered his writings burnt, after a struggle of the severest kind, and he gives Espino the credit of having brought it about.[2] Poza's impatient temper unfitted him to bear this sudden reverse with equanimity; his pen was busy and he wrote much that he might more wisely have kept to himself. The Inquisition took hold of him again. In November 1640 we hear of the progress of his case, of his being in exile at Navalcarnero and forbidden to leave it or to correspond with anyone. At this Urban VIII. was so rejoiced that he wrote a special letter of thanks to Sotomayor. In December Poza was transferred to the Jesuit college at Cuenca, where we hear of him in 1643; in 1645 his case is still dragging on, but he is permitted to leave the house and resume his duties in the pulpit and confessional. Probably the prosecution was never concluded, for he lingered forgotten in his exile until his death in 1660.[3]

In this case the final yielding of the Inquisition was due to local influences and not to any deference to the Roman censorship. Spanish stubbornness was even more strongly mani-

[1] Cartas de Jesuitas (Memorial, XV. 437).—Índice de Sotomayor, Supplem. p. 989.—Índice Último, p. 215.—The character of the expurgations against which all the Jesuits in Spain so bitterly fought may be judged from a single one—"Lib. III. fol. 741 et sequent. et ubicumque denegat *Mariæ et Jesu consuetas membranas et umbilicales venas*, et affirmat *solam nutrimentalem venam habuisse, et quod Maria in ventre Matris nutriebatur ore et non more aliorum puerorum. Partum Deiparæ caruisse secundinis*, dele."

[2] Carta al R. P. Horacio Caroche, No. 214 (Obras de Palafox, 1762, XI. 213); Carta al R. P. Diego de la Presentacion (Ib. XI. 560). Possibly the writings burnt may have been some of those produced in Poza's struggle with the Inquisition. They can hardly have been the *Elucidarium* and Apologies which are merely ordered in the Index to be expurgated.

[3] Cartas de Jesuitas (Memorial, T. XIII. p. 231; T. XVI. pp. 54, 80; T. XVII. p. 83; T. XVIII. p. 100).

Outside of Spain the Society of Jesus does not seem to have regarded Poza's performances with favor. His name is discreetly absent from Alegambe's "Bibliotheca Scriptorum Societatis Jesu," Antwerp, 1643.

fested in the celebrated question of the *Laminæ Granatenses* or *Plomos del Sacromonte*, although after a contest prolonged for a century, it was obliged apparently to give way. In 1588 an ancient building in Granada, known as the Torre Torpiana, was torn down, and in the process there was discovered a leaden box, coated with bitumen, inside and out, containing a bone, a linen cloth, and a parchment writing in Arabic characters, with a Latin inscription, signed in Arabic by "Cæcilius Bishop of Granada," reciting that the bone was a relic of St. Stephen the protomartyr, the cloth was half of that with which the Virgin dried her tears at the crucifixion, and the writing was a prophecy on the end of the world, by St. John the Evangelist, in which he foretold the advent of Mahomet and the rise of Lutheranism. The find was accepted as genuine and excited general veneration, although the critical eye of Pedro of Valencia pointed out that parchment, ink, and writing were all modern, with only a colorable imitation of antiquity.[1] This led to a still more daring attempt. Early in February, 1595, some treasure seekers among the ruins on a mountain about half a league from Granada, subsequently known as the Sacromonte, found a sheet of lead with characters difficult of decipherment. After many fruitless attempts a Jesuit made the inscription read "Corpus ustum Divi Mesitonis: passus est sub Neronis Imperatoris potentatu." The Archbishop of Granada, Pedro de Castro, was overjoyed at the discovery; he caused further searches to be made and in other caverns during March and April three more plates of lead were found, covered with bitumen and inscribed with similar characters, to the effect that in the caves of the holy mountain, in the second year of Nero, were burnt alive disciples of St. James—St. Cæcilius,

[1] José Godoy Alcántara, Historia crítica de los falsos Cronicones, Madrid, 1868, p. 6.—Copies and translations of these documents are given by Dr. Geddes in his "Account of the MSS. and Relicks found in the Ruins of the Turpian Tower . . . and in the Mountain called Valparayso."—Geddes's Miscellaneous Tracts, London, 1714, Vol. I. p. 383.

St. Hesychius, St. Ctesiphon and their followers.[1] The discoveries continued for two years, during which no less than eighteen books were found, inscribed some in Latin and some in beautiful Arabic script, on small circular leaden plates strung together. They purported to be revelations and prophecies recorded by St. James and his disciples Cæcilius and Ctesiphon. The successive discoveries were hailed with public rejoicings and salvos of artillery, innumerable miracles were wrought by the relics, and men of the highest station testified that they had seen brilliant splendors and processions of spirits hovering over the hallowed spot. Pilgrims by the thousand poured in from all parts of Spain to visit the holy ground, and crosses without number were erected there by the piety of individuals. Various religious Orders promptly contended for the privilege of founding a monastery there, and the archbishop inclined to favor the Cistercians, but the Virgin appeared to him and ordered him to build a church and house of secular canons. He obeyed and the resulting establishment, which was approved by Paul V. in 1609, grew wealthy through the offerings of the crowds of pilgrims, thus rendering the authenticity of the relics a matter of large pecuniary interest.

Learned Moors were employed on the translation of the leaden books; they were found to contain evidence in favor of the two matters dearest to Spanish religious zeal—the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin and the Spanish Apostolate of St. James. But in addition there were theological speculations of the loftiest character and of surpassing interest in the development of Christianity, as giving the undoubted inspiration of the apostles and of the Virgin on doctrines of the highest importance. To be sure, some of the teaching had a strange savor of Islam, such as the formula,

[1] These names were shrewdly borrowed from the Mozarabic ritual. The old martyrologies describe Cæcilius, Ctesiphon and Hesychius as sent to Spain to evangelize the land and as suffering martyrdom there.—Usuardi Martyrol. 15 Maii; Bedæ Martyrol. 15 Maii.

"Unity of God; there is no God but God, and Jesus the Spirit of God." Jesus, in fact, was repeatedly defined in the manner customary in the Koran, not as the Son of God, but as the Spirit of God, and many details were given of his life borrowed from the account in the Koran. St. James was made to record a revelation to the Virgin that the Arabs were to become the chosen people who in the latter days will be subject to a great king and will unite with the Christians in one religion and extend it throughout the world. The researches of Señor Godoy Alcántara would seem to leave no reason to doubt that the forgeries were the work of Moriscos —probably of the two translators employed, Miguel de Luna and Alonso del Castillo—who aimed at nothing less than the introduction of a new gospel which should bring about a compromise between the religions of Christ and Mahomet, and might eventually fuse the antagonistic races into one, thus saving the Moriscos from the destruction then impending over them. Care was also taken to enlist the weakness and greed of the Christians. It was stated that St. James and his disciples were divinely ordered to bring these books into Spain and to bury them on the Sacromonte, where in the fulness of time they would be discovered by a prelate of distinguished merit, and that salvation was assured to everyone who should visit the spot and give alms there.[1]

It shows the uncritical character of the learning of the period that in spite of the loathing entertained for Mahometanism and all connected with it, the forgeries gained acceptance almost universal, though this did not prevent the expulsion of the Moriscos a few years later. The Royal Council ordered Archbishop Pedro de Castro to proceed to a *calificacion*. An assembly of eighteen learned theologians declared unanimously that the books seemed to be dictated by the Holy Ghost and that the providence of God had preserved them to the present time to confound all heresies. A pro-

[1] José Godoy Alcántara, pp. 44–106.—López, El Sacro-Monte de Granada, Madrid, 1883, pp. 59–64, 72.

vincial synod was called in 1600 to pronounce upon the authenticity of the relics, which after due investigation were decided to be veritable and were ordered to be venerated accordingly. It is true that there were a few doubters. Benito Árias Montano, the greatest living Spanish scholar, was incredulous, but such was the general enthusiasm that he feared to express his opinion and evaded it on the pretext of illness. Juan Bautista Perez, Bishop of Segorbe, wrote an exposure of the fraud, but discreetly had it presented to the Royal Council under the name of the Licenciate Valcárcel. A Morisco Jesuit, Padre Casas, to whom the books were submitted, pronounced them to be heretical; he was at once obliged to leave Granada, when he went to Rome, where he propagated his opinions in safety. Gurmendi, a student of Arabic, is also mentioned as a doubter, and the shortness of the list shows how general was the credulity. The Dominicans, whose reverence for St. Thomas Aquinas prevented their acceptance of the Immaculate Conception, naturally were opposed to the new revelations, which pronounced all who disbelieved in the doctrine to be accursed and excommunicated and destined to damnation, but the only member of the Order who is recorded as daring to lift his voice against them was Fray Luis de Alliaga, the royal confessor. An opinion furnished in 1597 by Doctor Gregorio Lopez Madera, in which he assumes that time will be required before the books can be incorporated into the canon of Scripture, shows that this was in contemplation and that if Spain had possessed a national Church it would probably have been done, leading to a new form of Christianity.[1]

Fortunately Rome was convinced of the fraud and fought the delusion with a persistence which in the end could not fail to triumph. The nuncio at Madrid did not share the general enthusiasm and vainly insisted that the matter should be referred to the Holy See, as the only competent tribunal. Clement VIII. wrote repeatedly to Archbishop Pedro de

[1] Godoy Alcántara, pp. 107–18.—Ochoa, Epistolario Español, II. 45.

Castro, forbidding him to publish or divulge the books; no man of whatever rank was to express an opinion for or against them under pain of arbitrary censure and punishment; the plates and everything connected with them were to be sent forthwith to Rome where all questions concerning them would be decided. Absolute as were these commands they received no obedience. Succeeding popes made repeated efforts to obtain the plates with as little success. Finally Urban VIII., after the failure of milder methods, caused the Congregation of the Inquisition to adopt a constitution, May 5, 1639, describing the objects found in the Torre Torpiana and Sacromonte as affecting the faith; they are everywhere cited in books and sermons to support certain dogmas, and are daily acquiring increased veneration as papers of divine and canonical authority, although men of the greatest experience and learning adduce against them matters of the gravest moment and assert that they contain much that reeks with impiety, superstition and error. Therefore, to prevent the invasion of the Church by false doctrines under cover of supposititious names of apostles and their disciples, after mature deliberation with the Cardinals of the Congregation, he orders the said books, writings and plates to be suspended and prohibits any faith, veneration, or cult to be rendered to them until the Holy See shall decide as to their truth and doctrine; all glosses and writings upon them are to be surrendered to the inquisitors or episcopal ordinaries. Books or MSS. containing passing allusions to them are prohibited until such allusions are expunged. The acts of all assemblies that have been held for the approbation and interpretation of the plates are declared void, and no more are to be convened. No one hereafter is to write in defence of the plates, or translate them or cite them in speech or writing or quote others respecting them. All this is to be observed inviolably throughout the world. For any infraction the offender, of whatever rank he be, incurs *ipso facto* excommunication, removable only by the pope; if an ecclesiastic he forfeits all offices and benefices

and incurs perpetual disability; if a layman he is to be punished corporally and pecuniarily, at the discretion of the inquisitor or episcopal ordinary, and the same penalty is to be inflicted on printers who print any of the matters prohibited or suspended.[1] The sweeping severity of these provisions shows how great was the long pent-up wrath which at last burst forth. Yet though the constitution was enforced, at least in Rome, the extreme penalties were probably never meant to be inflicted. In 1652 Padre Carlo Salviati, preacher of the Jesuit house in Rome, alluded in a sermon to the Immaculate Conception and cited in proof of it St. Ctesiphon in the Granadine plates. A Dominican who chanced to be present was prompt in reporting him to the Inquisition. Innocent X. thereupon sent for the Jesuit General, scolded him roundly and suspended the offender, who was obliged in the pulpit to make a public apology and retraction drawn up for him by the Inquisition, while two notaries with copies of it watched him from below.[2]

In Spain, meanwhile the Dominicans had not been idle in undermining faith in the *plomos*. The Inquisition, in which their influence was preponderating, endeavored to assert jurisdiction over the questions involved, but the friends of the new gospels were too strong to permit of this, and for two years they were able in Rome to keep back the publication of the constitution of 1639, but at length it was issued and was published in Madrid about April 1, 1641. Possibly the successful revolution of Portugal in 1640 and the menacing Catalan troubles may have weakened the influence of the Spanish court and emboldened Urban to the publication. At first Philip IV. refused to surrender the originals and demanded that the examination should be made in Madrid, but finally the plates were surrendered to Innocent X., who appointed as translators the learned Fathers Kircher and Ludovico Marracci. Still the matter was bitterly fought step by

[1] Ochoa, Epistolario Español, II. 49. — Index Alexand. VII. Index Decretorum, No. 43, p. 340.

[2] Journal de M. de Saint-Amour, Paris, 1662, p. 203.

step, at an enormous expense which was a heavy drain on the resources of the partizans of the *plomos*. It was not till June 15, 1665, that Kircher's and Marracci's version was definitely completed, and seventeen years more were consumed before the final condemnation was issued, May 6, 1682, by Innocent XI. in a special brief, pronouncing the plates a pure fabrication designed to destroy the Catholic faith, prohibiting all books treating of the writings of the Torre Torpiana and Sacromonte, and ordering the expurgation of all allusions to them in other books.[1] The Spanish Inquisition was sullen under this invasion of its jurisdiction, but the decision came from the pope in the form of a papal brief; it was transmitted through King Carlos II.; at the request of the fiscal of the Royal Council the Supreme Council of the Inquisition consented to receive it, and though the canons of the Sacromonte petitioned Carlos II. to intercede with the pope for another examination before other judges the decision held good and the papal brief was printed in the Index of 1707, with the careful reservation that the prohibition did not include the relics or the veneration paid to them.[2]

Yet Spanish tenacity would not admit defeat, and the world had not heard the last of these frauds. The interest as well as the pride of the canons of the Sacromonte was involved in maintaining the genuineness of the forgeries, and they had well-nigh impoverished themselves in the costly struggle in Rome. In 1678, when defeat was apparent, their agent there,

[1] Josef Pellicer y Tobar, Avisos históricos (Valladares, Semanario erúdito, T. XXXII. pp. 21, 47).—Godoy Alcántara, pp. 119-28.—Index Innocent. XI. 1681, p. 172. The *Laminæ Granatenses* have since then retained their place in the Roman Indexes (Benedicti XIV. 1758, p. 148; Leonis XIII. 1887, p. 178).

Still the ardor of the supporters of the Immaculate Conception was unconquerable, and in spite of the papal prohibition Cardinal Sfondrati in 1698 dared to quote St. Ctesiphon in the *Laminæ Granatenses* as a witness to the apostolic origin of the dogma (Sfondrati Innocentia Vindicata, S. Galli, 1698, p. 44), nor was his work ordered to be expurgated in consequence.

[2] MSS. Royal Library of Copenhagen, 218*b* fol. p. 331.—Muñoz y Romero, Diccionario de los Reinos, etc., de España, p. 133.—Index Expurg. Hispanus, 1707, T. II. p. 26.

the great bibliographer Nicolás Antonio, had advised them to devote themselves to upholding the sacred character of the relics; these had been authoritatively pronounced genuine by the provincial synod of 1600; they were not included in the papal condemnation, and if they were admitted to be authentic it would gradually follow that the plates could not be discredited. When the brief was published in the Index of 1707 the canons bestirred themselves, and simultaneously there appeared a work in three folio volumes in support of the relics and of the virtues of Archbishop de Castro. This was followed in 1741 with another folio in the same sense. The miracles which accompanied the discovery were especially dwelt upon and no one could fail to draw the conclusion that the *plomos*, which were inseparably connected with the relics, were divine revelation. Among the canons of the Sacromonte the belief in the authenticity of the *libros Arabes*, as well as of the relics, remained unshaken in spite of the pontifical decree. Several of them amused themselves by writing books in their defence, and they had in this the sympathy of the highest authorities, for we are told that these labors earned for two of them, Pastor de los Cobos and Francisco de Viana y Bustos, membership in the *Real Academia de la Historia*. Ferdinand VI. even commissioned Viana and José de Laboraria to write a history of the finds of the Sacromonte. This intrepid and persistent advocacy might in time have accomplished its object had not the supporters of the *plomos* grown impatient and boldly endeavored to establish the authenticity of the old forgeries by new ones. In Granada a certain Don Juan de Flores, of antiquarian tastes, bought a property in which some Roman remains had been found and commenced to make excavations about the year 1753. He speedily produced innumerable articles in which Christian antiquity came to be represented as well as pagan. The canons of Sacromonte soon took a hand; the Canon Viana, Padre Juan de Echeverría and Don Cristóbal Conde distinguished themselves by the ardor with which they pros-

ecuted the researches and defended the results. Leaden plates were exhumed bearing directly upon those of the Sacromonte, fragments of a council of the apostles, tables of the articles and mysteries of the faith, writings of St. James, lost canons of the Council of Illiberis, and many other matters of the greatest importance in the development of Christianity. A laborer in the excavations, who intimated that articles were buried over night to be dug up in the morning, was legally prosecuted until he was driven insane, which inspired discretion in the rest, and fresh stories were circulated of splendors seen over the Sacromonte and aerial processions of spirits. Encouraged by success and immunity the forgers fabricated all manner of documents, titles of nobility, wills, royal letters, etc., which they slipped into the archives. It became known throughout Spain that such a factory existed in Granada and whoever needed a fraudulent paper came there for it. At last complaints were made to the government, which ordered an investigation. There was little difficulty in proving the forgeries; the criminals confessed and were condemned, Juan de Flores and Juan de Echeverría to eight years and Cristóbal Conde to four years' seclusion in designated convents, while all the manufactured articles were burnt in one of the public places of the city. By a decree of 1777 all writings in defence of these frauds were placed upon the Index.[1] Yet the Sacromonte is still a place of pilgrimage; in the Plaza del Triunfo of Granada there still stands a pillar erected in its honor and bearing in its inscriptions the names and martyrdoms of the saints as recorded in the *plomos*; and Don José de Ramos López, President of the canons, has recently printed a volume on the subject in which he passes over the

[1] Godoy Alcántara, pp. 314-25.—López, El Sacro-Monte de Granada, Madrid. 1883, pp. 138, 142-46.—Muñoz y Romero, Diccionario, p. 134.—Índice Último, p. 153.

For a partial bibliography of these frauds the reader can consult Struvii et Meuselii Biblioth. Histor. Lipsiæ, 1793, VI 1 194-6; and Muñoz y Romero, Diccionario, pp. 131-4.

papal condemnation as lightly as possible and assures us that Árias Montano and Bautista Perez affirmed the authenticity of the finds both of the Torre Torpiana and the Sacromonte.[1]

[1] López, El Sacro-Monte de Granada, pp. 29, 82–6, 121.

The vitality of these forgeries was largely owing to their ministering to popular wishes in establishing the Immaculate Conception and the Christianization of Spain by St. James. Of the latter there was no historical evidence, and the former was as yet too recent in origin to be authoritatively accepted as an article of faith. The success of the find in the Torre Torpiana led to another series of forgeries with the same object, which form a remarkable feature in Spanish literary history and of which a detailed account will be found in Señor Godoy Alcántara's work. In 1595 a learned Jesuit, Father Ramón de la Higuera, produced certain ancient chronicles which he described as having been found in the Abbey of Fulda. He submitted them to Juan Bautista Perez, Bishop of Segorbe, who curtly told him that they were fictions. For a while he remained silent, but the success of the still bolder forgeries of the Sacromonte encouraged him to publish them and add to them. He enlisted in his favor another Spanish weakness by aiding the ambitions of certain episcopal seats with proofs of their antiquity and of their possessing ample lists of saints and martyrs. His *Cronicones* were accepted as genuine and his success provoked a number of imitators, producing a vast mass of fictitious annals which incurably infected all the historical writing of the period. Even in Italy Cardinal Sfondrati in 1698 freely cites the chronicles of Dexter and Liutprand in support of the Immaculate Conception (Sfondrati, Innocentia Vindicata, p. 43). It was not until the advent of Philip V. had diminished monachal influence and had introduced a more critical spirit, with less dread of fanatic clamor, that the reasoning of the Marquis de Mondejar and of Nicolás Antonio was pushed to its legitimate conclusions, and finally the *España Sagrada* of Florez dispelled the remnants of the illusion. Yet Nicolás Antonio printed the *Cronicones* of Dexter, Maximus, and Eutrandus (Biblioth. Vetera, II. 411), and all these, with that of Liutprand, are included in the *Patrologia* of the Abbé Migne, T. XXXI., LXXX. and CXXXVI. As recently as 1843 Antonio María Sanchez Cid, "examinador sinodal del arzobispado de Sevilla," in his "Epitome histórico de la gran villa de Fregenal," quotes from the *Martirologia* of Padre Ramón and the *Cronicones* of Maximus and Haubertus, as if their authenticity had never been questioned (Barrantes, Aparato para la Historia de Extremadura, II. 193).

The most important of these forgeries was the earliest in date, the so-called Chronicle of Flavius Lucius Dexter, Bishop of Barcelona, extending from the death of Christ to his own time, A. D. 430. It represents the Virgin as the head of the infant Church, around whom the apostles are grouped and without whose advice and assent no step is taken. Forty-eight days after the Pentecost the apostles cast lots as to the provinces in which they are to labor, and Spain

There was an equally instructive struggle between Spain and Rome over the Catechism of Mésengui in 1761, but this time the Spanish and Roman censorships were in accord, and the significance of the affair lies in its being part of the struggle of the enlightened Carlos III. to emancipate the throne from the overgrown power of the Inquisition. François-Philippe Mésengui, a professor in the College of Beauvais, was an upholder of the Gallican Church—Sainte-Beuve alludes to him as a belated Port-Royalist. He made the acquaintance of the Roman censorship through his "Lettres

falls to St. James. It has been the first land outside of Judæa to be Christianized, and when he visits it in the year 37 he organizes it into bishoprics and builds the church of Nuestra Señora del Pilar at Saragossa, on the spot where the Virgin appears to him standing on a pillar. Ever since the coming of St. James the feast of the Immaculate Conception has been celebrated in Spain. When he was martyred after his return to Jerusalem it was by command of the Virgin that his disciples brought his body to Galicia in the year 42. In 50, St. Peter, bringing images from Antioch, comes to Spain, and since that time images have been venerated there. In 64 St. Paul visits Spain with Philemon, Timothy and other disciples, and it is thence that he writes the Epistle to the Hebrews. The Christianity of L. Annæus Seneca, so long vainly asserted, is proved beyond question, as is also the genuineness of the Epistles of the Virgin to St. Ignatius and to the Messenians (Chron. Dextri, Ed. Migne, pp. 87, 91, 98, 105, 110, 111, 131, 147, 162, 170, 190, 206, 211, 359, 463, 570). It would be difficult to concentrate more falsehoods in the same space, but these were pious frauds, and the Inquisition accepted them without investigation. In fact, about 1650 the Inquisitor General Arce y Reynoso ordered the fictitious saints and martyrs to be included in the litany as objects of veneration and intercession (Barrantes, op. cit. II. 392).

Even Padre Feyjoo, while assuming that the falsity of the *Cronicones* needs no argument, asserts that there can be no doubt as to the Spanish apostolate of St. James, and that that of St. Paul is nearly as certain (Theatro Crítico, T. IV. Discurso VIII. No. 44; Discurso XIII. No. 12). The curious as to the evidence on which rest the Spanish missions of St. James, St. Peter and St. Paul can find it in Natalis Alexander, Hist. Eccles. Sæc. I. Dissert. 15. In a papal brief of November 1, 1884, Leo XIII., after a careful investigation, pronounced in favor of the authenticity of the relics of Santiago at Compostella and of the legend that after his martyrdom his disciples, Athanasius and Theodorus, carried his body to Galicia, but Leo was careful to allude to St. James's mission to Spain as only an ancient and pious tradition (Boletin de la Real Academia de la Historia, VI. 143).

á un ami sur la Constitution Unigenitus," published in 1752, which was condemned in 1753. In 1744 he had issued anonymously a catechism in six volumes entitled "Exposition de la Doctrine Chrétienne," of which an enlarged edition appeared in 1754 and was placed on the Index by decree of November 21, 1757.[1] In spite of this two Italian versions appeared—one in Rome with the omission of the obnoxious passages on the infallibility of the popes and on their claim of supremacy over sovereigns, and the other in Naples, with the approval of the government, in successive volumes between 1758 and 1761. The Jesuits, regarding Mésengui as a Jansenist, made special efforts to have this condemned. Their general, Lorenzo Ricci, alarmed Clement XIII. as to the tendencies of the book, affirming that it contained more than a thousand errors, and he was seconded by Ricchini, the secretary of the Congregation of the Index, who had offended the Jesuits and desired to mollify them. The book was again submitted to the Congregation of the Inquisition; in spite of an earnest supplication from its aged author, it was again condemned, after a warm debate, by a vote of six to five—Cardinals Rezzonico, Torrigiani, Castelli, Ferroni, Erva and Ganganelli voting aye, and Corsini, Spinelli, Passionei, Galli and Orsi, nay. Tamburini was sick and sent his negative vote in writing, but it was ruled out; Cavalchini declined to vote, being unable to make up his mind. Clement was not content with the usual simple decree of the Congregation, but gave the work the special honor of a formal bull of condemnation, *Ad perpetuam rei memoriam*. Passionei was secretary of papal briefs; to avoid signing this one he left Rome, but Clement sent it after him with word that he must sign or resign. In a tempest of wrath he affixed his name to it; an hour later he had an apoplectic stroke and the next day he was dead. The anti-Jesuit Cardinals, Orsi,

[1] Index Benedicti XIV. pp. 97, 156.

Tamburini and Spinelli, soon followed him to the grave.[1] The bull under date of June 14, 1761, denounced the book as containing propositions respectively false, captious, ill-sounding, scandalous, perilous, suspect, audacious, contrary to the Apostolic Decrees and practice of the Church and in agreement with propositions already condemned and proscribed, and it forbade all editions and translations, even if expurgated and corrected by private persons.[2]

By this time the affair had attracted general attention. The condemnation of the book was virtually a challenge to all the monarchs of Europe. In Naples the bishops were forbidden to publish the bull until it should receive the royal exequatur.[3] In Spain, Carlos III. had been watching the progress of the case with much interest. His experience while on the Neapolitan throne had not led him to look upon the papal pretensions with favor, and he had a personal feeling involved in the matter as Mésengui's Catechism was used in the instruction of his son. He even seems to have anticipated that Clement would overrule the decision of the Congregation. In due time the brief was received by the Archbishop of Lepanto, papal nuncio at Madrid, who communicated it to Sir Richard Wall, the minister of state, telling him that it would take the usual course. Wall reported this to the king, who was about starting for San Ildefonso, and who clearly expressed his intention of not permitting its pub-

[1] Ferrer del Rio, Historia de Carlos III., I. 384-6.—Reusch, Der Index, II. 763-4.

Reusch quotes a popular rhyme, current in the streets of Rome—

É morto Passionei
É morto d'accidente
Amazzato da Clemente
Per quel breve benedetto,
Che soscrisse a suo dispetto.

Piange Speranza [his secretary]
Baldriotti [his confessor] fa instanza,
Bottari [a friend] fa tempesta,
E al Gesù si fa festa.

[2] Bullar. Roman. Contin., Prati, 1842, T. IV. p. 521.—Index Leonis XII. p. 160.—Index Leonis XIII. p. 165.

[3] Reusch, II. 765.

lication, but Wall neglected to inform the nuncio. The bull was laid before the Supreme Council of the Inquisition and was duly approved; a condemnatory edict was hastily drawn up, without subjecting the book to the ordinary *calificacion;* this was ordered to be published in two days, and copies were delivered to the royal confessor, Fray Joaquin Eleta, on the night of August 7. It was not until the morning of the 8th that the confessor could convey it to the king, who at once ordered his minister to send a messenger to the inquisitor general, Manuel Quintano Bonifaz, instructing him to suspend the edict and to recall such copies as had been sent out. Between 7 and 8 in the evening Bonifaz received this command, and at once replied that the routine of the Inquisition had been observed; that already that morning the edict had been distributed to the churches and convents of the city and had been forwarded to most of the tribunals throughout Spain. To recall it would cause grave scandal, injurious to the honor of the Inquisition and to the obedience due to the Holy See, and if known to be by royal order would embarrass the jurisdiction of the Holy Office. It was therefore with the deepest grief that he found himself unable to have the satisfaction of obeying the king.[1]

This overt resistance provoked the royal wrath. Carlos regarded it as an effort on the part of the Inquisition to throw off all subjection to his authority and believed that it had been secretly arranged between the nuncio and the inquisitor general. He therefore ordered Bonifaz to absent himself to a distance of twelve leagues from the court and bade him consider how best to reconcile in the matter the royal supremacy with the respect due to the pope. Bonifaz promptly obeyed, and on the 12th betook himself to the Benedictine monastery of Nuestra Señora de Sopetran, about three leagues from Madrid. Twenty days' retirement brought repentance. He addressed to Wall an humble apology, protesting that he

[1] Ferrer del Rio, I. 386-9.

had intended no disobedience and that he would forfeit his life rather than fail in the respect due to the king. Carlos accepted this and ordered the Royal Council to announce to him that his exile was at an end and that he could resume the exercise of his functions. The Supreme Council of the Inquisition thereupon expressed its gratification to the king, who replied with a laconic warning to remember the lesson. The frightened nuncio had already placed himself under cover and in a written explanation had thrown all the blame on Bonifaz.[1]

Yet in spite of all this the edict was never withdrawn and the condemnation of the Catechism held good.[2] Nevertheless Carlos was resolved to reap the full benefit of his victory. The Royal Council was ordered to report on the matter, and on August 27 presented a *consulta* proving that the king could suspend the publication of a papal brief, could banish the inquisitor general, and could ask satisfaction of the pope. This was insufficient, and the Council was required to consider the most efficacious means of preventing the repetition of such invasions of the royal power.[3] On October 31 it therefore presented a second *consulta* in which it declared that any intrusion by the pope on the rights of the crown or of the subject is to be resisted; any papal letters prejudicial to either are to be seized by the Council and returned to the pope with the prayer that he inform himself better and act accordingly, and a routine was prescribed by which this should be carried out.[4] This resulted in the *Pragmática del Exequatur* of January 18, 1762, which ordered that no bull, brief, rescript or papal letter, addressed from Rome to any tribunal, junta, judge or prelate, should be published without having been first presented to the king by the nuncio; that bulls or briefs for individuals should be submitted to the Royal Council to see if they affected the Concordat or preju-

[1] Ferrer del Rio, I. 389-93.
[2] Índice Último, p. 99.
[3] Ferrer del Rio, I. 393.
[4] This *consulta* is in MS. Royal Library of Copenhagen, 216 fol.

diced the *regalias* and the good customs and uses of the realm. The only exceptions were briefs and dispensations from the papal penitentiary relative to the *for intérieur* of the conscience. It is true that this *Pragmática* was withdrawn by decree of July 5, 1763, through the influence of the confessor, Fray Eleta, who worked on the king's superstition by pointing out that the disastrous capitulation of Havana occurred nearly on the anniversary of the banishment of Bonifaz; but it was reissued in even more rigorous form, June 15, 1768, the dispensations of the penitentiary being subjected to the episcopal ordinaries, for the humiliating precaution of seeing that they involved no infraction of discipline, and that they were in accordance with the Council of Trent.[1] A royal cédula, bearing date the next day (June 16) provided that no brief or order of the Roman curia concerning the Inquisition, even if it were a prohibition of books, should be executed without notice to the king and without having obtained the permission of the Royal Council as an indispensable preliminary requisite.[2] To guard against any surreptitious evasion of this regulation, in 1769 the local superintendents of the press throughout the kingdom were straitly charged not to permit the printing, reprinting or importation of any papal bull or rescript, or any letters of generals or superiors of religious orders, without the licence of the Royal Council.[3]

The result of the condemnation of Mésengui's Catechism was thus to strengthen greatly the position of the *regalistas* or defenders of the royal prerogative. Over this there had been a long struggle which has a bearing on our subject demanding consideration.

[1] Ferrer del Rio, I. 394–5, 398.—Novísima Recop. II. iii. 9.
[2] Nueva Recop. I. vii. 38 cap. 5.
[3] Ibid. VIII. xvi. 27.

THE REGALISTAS.

The Spanish Church and State have thus far presented themselves to us as in alliance to maintain constituted authority, spiritual and temporal, at the expense of popular liberties. The case of Mésengui's Catechism however shows that the allies were not always in accord over the division of the spoils, and that the Inquisition, which at times was so convenient an instrument in subjecting the people to the crown, could not always be relied upon when the question was between the crown and the tiara. Still less was dependence to be placed upon it when its own interests were at stake as the executive body of spiritual authority.

The medieval Church had asserted its supremacy over kings and its jurisdiction within their dominions in many ways submitted to with more or less impatience by feudal rulers embarrassed by the doubtful allegiance of their nobles. With the growth of the modern monarchy these pretensions became still more irksome as incompatible with the autonomy of the State, and the Reformation, by dividing Europe into two camps, enabled the sovereigns who remained faithful to Rome to assert their independence as the price of their support. Of all monarchs the King of Spain was the most absolute and the most resolute to preserve his prerogative against papal encroachment. Spain had always asserted the right to regulate the internal affairs of her Church in many points which conflicted with the claims of the Holy See and with ecclesiastical privilege as defined in the canon law. How bitter were the debates thence arising may be seen in the celebrated *parecer*, or opinion, which the learned Dominican Melchor Cano, afterwards Bishop of the Canaries, drew up in 1555 at the request of Charles V. respecting his differences with Paul IV. Cano does not hesitate to argue that to yield to the pretensions of the Roman curia would be to enable it to destroy the Church

with its avarice, and he even suggests that Satan is laboring to prevent the emperor from settling the points in dispute in hopes that the matter may be postponed for a less religious successor to handle.[1] In practice the Spanish kings usually vindicated with success the *regalias* or rights which they held to be inherent in the crown, but in the field of specu'ation there were innumerable questions to be debated by publicists and canon lawyers. The advocates of the royal prerogative were known as *regalistas* and were naturally the objects of special animadversion in Rome, where the Index was a powerful instrumentality in securing the triumph of Ultramontanism and was used unreservedly for that purpose. On the other hand, self-preservation required the support of the *regalistas* by the kings whose cause they defended. Thus Roman censorship and Spanish censorship, which could unite their energies against Lutheran and Calvinist, were here irreconcilably at issue, and the quarrel was complicated by the determination of the Inquisition to maintain at any cost the supremacy of its jurisdiction over that of all secular tribunals.

The Inquisition, in fact, had no hesitation in using its powers of censorship in the most arbitrary manner to sustain its aggressions upon the other departments of government. *Competencias*, or conflicts of jurisdiction between it and other spiritual and secular courts, were of constant occurrence and were conducted with a ferocity which filled the land with confusion. In one of these, where the royal criminal tribunal of Granada had arrested four employees of the Inquisition, in 1623, and the matter was brought before the Royal Council as an invasion of the immunity of the Holy Office, Don Luis de Gubiel, judge of the *Chancelleria*, or royal court of

[1] Llorente, Coleccion Diplomática, p. 10.—It is no wonder that Melchor Cano, who had already in 1548 been denounced in Rome, was cited before the Apostolic Chamber in 1556 as "Perditionis filius Melchior Canus, diabolicis motus suasionibus, etc." (Reusch, Der Index, I. 303). Yet he has always been regarded as one of the glories of Spanish theology, at a time when Spanish theologians were supreme. See Menendez y Pelayo, II. 712.

Granada, presented to the Council a legal argument justifying the royal jurisdiction, whereupon the Inquisitor General Pacheco ordered a *calificacion* of it, and in accordance with the report of his *calificadores* condemned it as containing "suspicious" propositions, caused it to be suppressed and commenced a prosecution for heresy against its author. The Royal Council, outraged by this violent interference with a matter pending before it, could only advise the king that there was nothing in Gubiel's report deserving of such treatment, and that the inquisitor general should be prohibited from carrying the matter further. The *consulta del consejo* of October 30, 1761, alludes to the numerous writings in defence of the *regalías* which had thus been censured by the Inquisition and to the terror which it inspired in all who sought to defend against it the royal prerogative.[1]

Thus the Inquisition was an uncertain ally of the crown in its quarrels with the Roman censorship over the questions relating to the royal prerogative. It could generally be relied upon, however, when the strife was simply between the monarch and the Holy See. This gave rise to an antagonism of censorship in which Rome at first had the best of it. The earliest encounter was over the *Apologia de juribus principalibus*, by a Spanish Jesuit, Juan de Roa of Ávila, printed in 1591 with the approbation of the Inquisition and dedicated to Philip II. This was promptly put on the Index of Clement VIII. in 1596, and Spain seems to have submitted.[2] It was possibly owing to this case that Clement, in the Instructions prefixed to his Index—which have since then always been printed in the successive Indexes—ordered the expurgation of all propositions contrary to ecclesiastical liberty, immunity and jurisdiction. Some ten years later another Jesuit, Henrique Henriquez, one of the most profound theologians of

[1] MSS. Royal Library of Copenhagen, 216 fol.—Gubiel's argument however is not in the 1640 Index of Sotomayor.

[2] Index Clement. VIII. fol. 30.—Reusch, Der Index, II. 378.

his day, wrote his *De Clavibus Romani Pontificis*, in which he defended the *recurso de fuerza* by which, like the *appel comme d'abus* in France, there was an appeal from the spiritual courts to the Royal Council. By order of the papal nuncio this was called in and burnt so successfully that only three or four copies survived, one of which is in the Escorial.[1] It was impossible that an absolute monarch could permit a foreign power thus to publish to his subjects that the daily legal practice in his kingdom was illegal and heretical. When, therefore, another book on the same subject by Jerónimo de Cevallos came under discussion in Rome, Philip III. felt it necessary to interfere. In 1619 he wrote to his ambassador, Cardinal Borja, that the Congregation of the Index had the work under consideration, that some of the cardinals were understood to incline towards its prohibition, and he charged his envoy to intervene with the pope and to prevent the condemnation of a book which maintained the right of protection over his subjects inherent in the sovereign. The effort was vain and the work was prohibited by decree of December 12, 1624.[2] Then at last the Spanish censorship exercised its independence and refused to ratify the condemnation.

A quarrel such as this could only grow more bitter with time. It was difficult for a Spaniard to write a legal work on many branches of jurisprudence without offending the papal susceptibilities, even if he only treated the law as he found it in daily practice, and Rome, on the other side, having once taken position could not recede. The next writer to feel its wrath was Francisco Salgado de Somoza, president of the Royal Council and subsequently Abbot of Alcalá la Real. His work on the *recurso de fuerza* appeared in 1626 and was prohibited in Rome by decree of April 12, 1628. The brief

[1] Vic. de la Fuente, Hist. Ecles. de España, Ed. 1855, T. III. p. 269.

[2] Alcubilla, Códigos antiguos de España, p. 1591.—Llorente, Coleccion Diplomática, p. 22.—Librorum post Indicem Clementis VIII. prohibitorum Decreta, Romæ, 1624, pp. 165–66.—Elenchus Librorum Omnium, etc. Romæ, 1632, p. 283.

was delivered to the inquisitor general, but Philip IV. forbade its publication, and in 1634 he wrote to Cardinal Borja to represent to the pope that on juridical questions every man should be allowed to retain his opinions, but that if the pope forbade works favorable to the king, he would forbid those which upheld the claims of the pope.[1] If Philip desired to placate the Holy See he adopted an injudicious method in sending thither Domingo Pimentel, Bishop of Córdoba, and Juan de Chumacero with a memorial in which the abuses of the papal jurisdiction in Spain, its greed, its venality and the misery which it caused, were described in the most uncompromising fashion. His envoys remained in Rome for ten years, exchanging missives of this kind which only aggravated the mutual ill-feeling. In 1639 and 1640 relations became still more embroiled by the quarrel with the nuncios Campeggio and Facchinetti, the latter of whom was only recognized after a year's delay under humiliating conditions. Matters became worse when Salgado's *Tractatus de Supplicatione* was condemned in 1640 and Solorzano's *Disputationes de Indiarum Jure* were forbidden in 1642, and Rome brought the quarrel to a head in December, 1646, by condemning six or eight similar works in mass and demanding through the nuncio at Madrid that they should likewise be prohibited in Spain.[2]

[1] Philip commenced to execute his threat by ordering the expurgation, from the Annals of Cardinal Baronius, of the *Tractatus* on the crown of Sicily (Menendez y Pelayo, III. 42). For the controversy over Baronius see Reusch, Der Index, II. 377 *sqq*.

[2] Reusch, Der Index, II. 373–5.—Llorente, Coleccion Diplomática, p. 23. —MSS. of Bodleian Library, Arch Seld. A. Subt. 16.—Elenchus Librorum Omnium, Romæ, 1632, p. 232.—Index Innocent. XI. 1681, pp. 105, 155.—Index Alexand. VII. Decretorum Index No. 51.

Salgado's *Tractatus de Supplicatione ad Sanctissimum a Literis et Bullis Apostolicis* is a learned defence of the royal right to suspend papal bulls—a practice in which he declared that there was nothing which could offend the pope or detract from the pious obedience which the Catholic kings and nation were wont to pay willingly to the Holy See (P. I. c. iii. No. 15). He has no hesitation in quoting his previously condemned *Tractatus de regia potestate*

It was impossible not to take up the challenge so boldly made. The Spanish monarchy was fearfully weakened; to the loss of Portugal had succeeded the revolt of Catalonia, but it was not so abased as to sink into a dependency of the Patrimony of St. Peter. The insult was rendered the more galling because the nuncio, doubtless acting under instructions, had caused the decree of condemnation, against all precedent, to be published without transmitting it through the Inquisition for its action, thus exercising an act of sovereignty in a matter most nearly affecting the dignity of the crown. Consultations were held in the different Councils, and in November, 1647, Philip issued an *auto* in which he ordered the papal decree to be suppressed; the nuncio was rebuked and was told that if the offence were repeated the royal indignation would manifest itself in a more decisive way; the ambassador at Rome was instructed to represent the high resentment which was felt, so that the Holy See should be taught that this was not a mere matter of opinion in which it could interfere and give laws to the government about rights coeval with the crown and always uninterruptedly enjoyed. Opportunity was taken to reassert in the most emphatic manner the independence of the Spanish Inquisition as to censorship, and the nullity, without its approval, of the acts of the Roman Congregations. The books which had been censured were by authors so pious, Catholic, and learned that they had merited, before printing, the approbation of the Council and the licence of the bishops, and they had been current in full view of the Inquisition which watched so closely over everything within its jurisdiction. "All this is matter of the highest prejudice, for it offends the royal preeminence and the authors who defend it and the ministers who exercise it. The government is disturbed, its vassals are

as irrefragable, and in citing as an authority the forbidden *De Clavibus Pontificis* of Henriquez. It would almost seem to be in a spirit of mockery that he prefixed to the work a declaration in which he submitted it and himself in the most absolute manner to the censure and correction of the Church.

rendered unquiet and doubtful in fidelity, and rival kingdoms are given opportunity to talk as they are wont."[1] It is not likely that Rome was much troubled by this expression of indignation; the books condemned remained on the papal Index, but Spain had asserted its independence in the most formal manner, and its monarchs continued to exercise their prerogatives regardless of the implied heresy attributed to them.

In a case such as this the Inquisition and the crown had interests in common—if the latter had failed to vindicate its independence the former would speedily have been reduced to subjection under the Roman Congregations. In such a struggle its loyalty could therefore be counted on, but there were other cases in which its interests or the ambition of its chiefs led it to side with Rome. It was, in fact, officially accused of taking especial pleasure in condemning books which upheld the *regalías* in matters pertaining to ecclesiastical privileges and immunities, to the great injury of the rights of the crown and of its vassals.[2] When, therefore, books appeared which assailed the royal prerogative, the State was sometimes obliged to rely upon its own resources and to employ against the Church the weapons with which the Church had armed it for use against the common enemy, the heretics. The State, while providing for the strict preliminary examination of books before publication, had trusted to the Inquisition for the suppression of those which should be found dangerous, but when the Inquisition failed in this duty it had no hesitation in assuming the functions of condemnation and suppression. In 1694 a work entitled *Casos reservados á su Santidad*, attributed to Doctor Francisco Barambio, appeared which impugned the royal prerogatives. Perhaps the matters

[1] Autos Acordados, Lib. I. Tit. vii. Auto 14.—Novísima Recop. VIII. xviii. 2.—The *Consulta del Consejo* on which this *auto* was framed is in the Biblioteca Nacional, Seccion de MSS. S. 294, fol. 66.

[2] Consulta del Consejo de 30 Ott., 1761 (MSS. Royal Library of Copenhagen, 216 fol.).

discussed touched too nearly the papal power for the Inquisition willingly to condemn it; perhaps the disinclination to do so was an incident in the struggle then deepening between the royal and inquisitorial jurisdictions. From whatever cause the book was never placed upon the Index, but a royal *auto* denounced it as containing many propositions contrary to the *regalías* and jurisdiction of the crown, wherefore all copies and the original MS. were ordered to be surrendered to the Royal Council; the book was not to be reprinted in Spain or imported from abroad, or sold, used, or quoted, or cited in writing or in speech, and printers and booksellers disobeying these commands were threatened with the confiscation of one-half of their property, besides arbitrary penalties at the discretion of the Council.[1] This was simple self-preservation. A *consulta* of the Councils of State and of the Indies in 1727 pointed out that if the nations submitted to the Roman condemnation of books defending the royal prerogative, while those presenting the papal views were allowed free currency, it would not be long before the Holy See would be the universal temporal monarch exercising the power of deposing kings at pleasure.[2]

This assertion was not uncalled for, as the independence of the Spanish monarchy had not long before been seriously compromised in the affair of Macanáz, which was a warning to defenders of the royal prerogative not to put their trust in princes. Clement XI. had taken part in the arrangements by which Louis XIV. placed his grandson Philip V. on the throne of Spain, and had recognized him as king. In the war which followed, the pope, to preserve his own dominions, was forced to change sides and to acknowledge the Archduke Charles. Philip, naturally indignant, dismissed the nuncio from Madrid and forbade all intercourse with Rome, especially the export of money thither, and justified this in a man-

[1] Autos Acordados, Lib. I. Tit. vii. Auto 21.

[2] La España bajo el poder arbitrario desde 1820 á 1832, Paris, 1833, p. 191.

ifesto. Clement rejoined in a brief, October 2, 1709, addressed to the Spanish clergy, in which he condemned the manifesto and ordered them to withhold the payment of the *tercio* and *escusado*—taxes on the clergy which formed a large portion of the royal revenues. The quarrel dragged wearily on, and in 1713 the Royal Council was ordered to prepare a *consulta* as to the relations of the monarchy with the papal court, and the action to be taken under the circumstances. Melchor Rafael de Macanáz, formerly a professor of Salamanca, was fiscal general, and in this capacity he drew up two reports, December 19, 1713, and January 2, 1714. These celebrated papers discuss the same abuses as the memorial of Philip IV. in 1634, but they are not, like that document, a fervid exposition of the evils caused by the greed of the Roman curia, but a lawyerlike argument to prove that the king has the power to protect his subjects from them. They were not published, but Don Luis Curiel violated his oath of secrecy and betrayed them to the Inquisition, which pronounced them heretical and schismatic. Clement not only confirmed this judgment, but ordered the Spanish Inquisitor General, Cardinal Giudice, to proceed against them. Giudice at the time was Spanish ambassador at Paris. Although he was thus the representative of his king and entrusted with the defence of his interests, his fealty to Rome overcame all other considerations; on July 30, 1714, he affixed on the door of his residence an edict prohibiting the reports of Macanáz as audacious, calumnious and contrary to the true doctrine of the Church, and on August 15 this edict was posted on all the church doors of Madrid. With incredible audacity, Giudice had included in the edict various French works in favor of the royal prerogative including one by President Talon. Such an act by a stranger, the ambassador of a friendly power, was too serious an invasion of the royal jurisdiction, and Louis XIV. promptly banished the officious cardinal from France. Philip V., who had thus been betrayed by his agent, could do no less. He dismissed Giudice from

his position as inquisitor general and relegated him to his Sicilian diocese, a disgrace for which he was compensated by the praises of the pope. The Inquisition moreover was contumacious and refused to withdraw the condemnation of the reports of Macanáz and even threatened to proceed against him as a heretic; Gil de Taboada, selected by Philip as Giudice's successor, declined to act; a Dominican, brother of Macanáz, who was appointed, was rejected by the Inquisition, and Clement declared that he would confirm no one in Giudice's place. Philip had serious thoughts of completely remodelling the Inquisition, and dismissed from his council the members of the clerical party, but the reaction soon came. Through Philip's second marriage with Elizabeth Farnese, Alberoni, a firm friend of Giudice, triumphed over the Princesse des Ursins and secured her banishment. This court revolution changed the aspect of affairs and Philip's weakness yielded. By a decree of March 28, 1715, drawn up for him by Giudice, and addressed to the Supreme Council of the Inquisition, he made his peace with that dreaded body. In the most humiliating terms he announced that he had been evilly counselled in the matter of the reports of Macanáz; it had never been his intention to lay his hand on the sanctuary nor to claim other rights than those consistent with religion; being now fully informed he had dismissed the ministers who had deceived him, and had annulled all the decrees issued at their suggestion. He ordered Cardinal Giudice to resume without delay the duties of his office, as his dismissal had been null, and he restored to their places the councillors whom he had discharged, with the assurance that their honor had suffered no prejudice. Don Luis Curiel in fact received Macanáz's office as the reward of his treachery. Although Giudice resigned in 1716, Philip's submission and the triumph of the Inquisition were complete. In the safe refuge of France Macanáz defied the repeated summons of the Inquisition to appear for trial and its excommunication for his contumacy. For thirty years he continued to enjoy the confi-

dence of Philip and of his son Fernando VI. in many diplomatic capacities, but he displeased the latter in 1747 when plenipotentiary at the Congress of Breda, by agreeing with England that Spain should abandon the Family Compact in return for the restitution of Gibraltar and Minorca; he was recalled to Spain and thrown into prison at Coruña, where he lay for twelve years, till the death of Ferdinand VI., dying soon after his release in 1760 at the age of 91. His writings in defence of the *regalías* remained to the end in the Spanish Index, though Rome contemptuously omitted his name from hers.[1]

A still more unfortunate upholder of the royal prerogative was the Augustinian friar, Manuel Santos de San Juan *alias* Berrocosa, who wrote a work entitled *Ensaya de el Theatro de Roma* in which, like Marsilio of Padua, he argued in favor of the secular supremacy as exercised by the emperors over the early Church, and did not spare the vices and failings of the Holy See. The work never was printed, but copies were

[1] Reusch, Der Index, II. 780.—V. de la Fuente, Hist. Ecles. de España, III. 347.—Menendez y Pelayo, III. 45.—Llorente, Coleccion Diplomática, p. 27.—Macanáz, Regalías de los Reyes de Aragon, Introduccion, Madrid, 1879.—Bacallar y Sanna, Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire d'Espagne sous le règne de Philippe V., Amsterdam (Paris), 1756, T. III. pp. 120 *sqq.*—Índice Último, pp. 104, 166.

For Philip's apologetic decree see Appendix. Yet when Giudice went to Rome in 1717 he was ordered to remove the arms of Spain from above his door.—Histoire publique et secrete de la Cour de Madrid (par J. Rousset), Cologne, 1719, p. 270.

Macanáz was a zealous Catholic and wrote several works in defence of the Inquisition, of which one was published in two volumes, Madrid, 1788. The design of suppressing the Holy Office has been attributed to him, but nothing was further from his thoughts, though as an ardent *regalista* he desired to subject it completely to the crown. A *consulta* which he drew up in conjunction with Don Martin de Mirabal shows that he wished to make its officials removable at pleasure by the king; that it should have no jurisdiction over royal officials whose conduct had the king's approbation, and that it should be deprived of the power of confiscation.—Macanáz, Regalías de los Reyes de Aragon, Madrid, 1879, p. xxxvi.

circulated in MS. He was seized by the Inquisition of Toledo, September 10, 1756, and sentenced October 14, 1758. His book was strictly prohibited—even persons holding licences were ordered to surrender all copies. The author was required to abjure his heresies and was shut up for ten years in the convent of Risco, near Ávila, an Augustinian house of the strictest observance. For the first four of these years he was imprisoned in a cell, and only allowed to see the episcopal director appointed to confirm his return to the true faith. Notwithstanding his abjuration, his convictions remained unaltered, and his temper was not improved by discipline. He employed the later years of his confinement in writing a *Memorial de Descargos* addressed to the king to show that he had been unjustly persecuted for maintaining the royal power, and also sixteen works of a more comprehensive character. Rome is Babylon, the habitation of demons and unclean spirits of all vices; the pope is a man who endeavors to be greater than his Creator, and the adoration paid to him is idolatry; the constitution of the Church is as different from that of the apostles as black from white; the clergy are bloodsuckers who exhaust the people, and their undue numbers are the destruction of the land; there should be no orders higher than that of priests, who should live by the labor of their hands, and the possessions of the Church should be distributed among the poor; the Inquisition is the chief instrument for undermining the power rightfully inherent in the crown, and has caused the death of a million of human beings; it is heresy to deprive anyone of life for heresy and contrary to the law of Christ to enforce the faith with stripes, the stake, *sanbenitos*, and the disabilities of descendants to the fourth generation; all this the king should rectify and bring back the Church to its proper state of apostolic simplicity. It is significant of the state of public opinion in Spain that the audacious friar found assistants, both lay and clerical, to copy these voluminous and incendiary writings,

to circulate them and to convey them to the ministers of Carlos III. Word was brought to the Inquisition and in November, 1767, when the term of Fray Berrocosa's captivity was drawing to an end, orders were sent to the prior of the convent to shut him up again strictly in his cell, to allow him to communicate with no one but himself, and to deprive him of all books save his Breviary and of the use of pen and ink. Ten months later, on August 28, 1768, the feast of St. Augustin, the neighboring magnates and clergy were invited to the convent and were enjoying a banquet in the refectory when suddenly Fray Berrocosa appeared among them. He had wrenched off the staples and locks of the two doors of his prison; despite his solitary confinement he must have learned what was going on, for he went directly to the Alcalde of Villatoro saying "As minister of our lord the king I place in your hands this memorial and these twenty-four tracts, drawn up for his service and the public good." Before the friars could recover from their stupor he had disappeared, although the convent door was fastened, and for seventeen months he eluded pursuit, but he was finally captured and thrown into the inquisitorial prison of Toledo, January 25, 1770. He was now in every way a relapsed heretic, both as a fugitive from the penance imposed on him and as maintaining the errors which he had abjured. As such under the canon law he could have been burnt without trial, but this would have been impolitic. He was regularly tried again and on April 16, 1771, he was sentenced to imprisonment for life in the convent of Sarria in Galicia in a cell which he was never to leave except to hear mass; he was to have no writing materials and no books save such spiritual ones as might be selected by his spiritual director, who was to be responsible for his safe-keeping and for his being cut off from communication with everyone, and who was required to make monthly reports concerning him to the Inquisition of Compostella. He was evidently regarded as a most danger-

ous prisoner, and it is to be presumed that he rotted to death in his prison.[1]

Fray Manuel Santos was evidently too revolutionary a champion of the royal prerogative for Carlos III. to feel safe in protecting him, though we have seen how the crown reasserted itself at this time in the affair of the Catechism of Mésengui. In this the king did not content himself with merely prescribing the rules respecting papal briefs, but laid down regulations designed to keep the censorial functions of the Inquisition under subordination to the State, and to correct some of the more flagrant abuses inseparable from its methods. This reform was developed in a *cédula* of January 18, 1762, but like the other it was recalled in July, 1763, to be reissued June 16, 1768. In this he appealed to the spirit of the constitution *Sollicita ac provida* of Benedict XIV. in 1753 which reformed the proceedings of the Roman Congregations; he decreed that the Inquisition should not prohibit the work of a Catholic known to be of good fame and learning without giving him a hearing, or, if he were a foreigner or dead, without appointing for him an advocate of good repute and knowledge. The circulation of books was not to be suspended under the plea that they were undergoing examination; in those to be expurgated the objectionable passages were to be speedily designated so that the current reading of them should not be interrupted, and any particular propositions condemned were to be clearly specified, so that they could be expurgated by the owners. Prohibition was to be employed only for the eradication of errors and superstí-

[1] Sentencia de Fray Manuel Santos de San Juan, alias Berrocosa (MSS. of the Königl. Universitäts-Bibliothek of Halle, Yc. 20, T. XI.).

Llorente gives an imperfect account of this case (II. 429), saying that the records of it were withdrawn from the Inquisition of Toledo and submitted by Carlos III. in 1768 to the bishops assembled to deliberate on the affairs of the Jesuits.

It is observable that the *Ensayo de el Theatro de Roma*, though so strictly prohibited, does not appear in the Índice Último, 1790.

tions prejudicial to religion, and lax opinions subversive of Christian morality. Finally, no edict was to be published until it had been submitted to the king and returned with his approval.[1]

This placed the Inquisition under wholesome restrictions and subjected its censorship wholly to the king. Llorente tells us that it complained loudly of these rules as an invasion of its rights, and that although it could not openly resist, in practice it nullified them by continuing to condemn books in secret, without hearing the authors, and rendering the submission to the king a mere formality after the edict of prohibition had been printed.[2] Perpetual vigilance, in fact, was necessary to keep in check so arbitrary a tribunal, and under the reactionary Carlos IV., who succeeded to the throne in 1788 such vigilance was not to be expected. Still, an occurrence in 1792 shows that in spite of Llorente's assertion authors were at least sometimes given the opportunity of defence. A communication from the inquisitor general represented to Carlos IV. that the *obra Filosófica y Matemática* of Fray Francisco Villalpando had been denounced to the Inquisition; the censures upon it had been delivered to him to reply to and return but he had refused to do so and had presented the papers to the Royal Council; whereupon the king ordered him to return them to the Inquisition which should have full scope for its jurisdiction.[3]

Carlos III. seems not to have relied upon the Inquisition to defend the royal prerogative. When the Dominican Mamachi wrote a work impugning the *Regalía de Amortizacion,* or control over mainmorte, royal orders of 1769 and 1781 direct its examination by the Royal Council; if found to deserve condemnation it is to be prohibited, all copies are

[1] Novísima Recop. II. iv. 11; VIII. xviii. 3. Cf. Benedicti XIV. Bull. *Solicita ac provida,* §§ 9, 10 (Bullar. Benedicti XIV. Ed. 1762. T. IV. p. 51).

[2] Llorente, Hist. Critique, I. 283–4.

[3] Alcubilla, Códigos antiguos de España, p. 1591.

to be surrendered, and meanwhile any importations are to be detained at the custom houses. When the prerogative was threatened, the king had no hesitation in suspending the circulation of a work during examination.[1]

Thus the Inquisition, though frequently an instrument in the hands of the monarch, at times asserted its independence and refused to be controlled. In the struggles thus provoked the State gradually obtained the upper hand, and the sovereign power, for its own protection, did not hesitate to exercise the functions which at first it had relegated exclusively to the Holy Office.

CENSORSHIP BY THE STATE.

We have seen that when censorship was systematized by the edict of 1558 the State reserved to itself the function of licensing the publication of books and the preliminary examination requisite for that purpose, while confiding to the Inquisition the task of purifying printed literature and preserving the faithful from the contamination of lurking heresy. The duty thus assumed by the State was one of no little magnitude and complexity. In the latter half of the sixteenth century, before the benumbing influence of the censorship had made itself felt, the intellectual activity of Spain was great. Under Charles V. and Philip it was the wealthiest land in Europe and was the centre of the political movements which governed the civilized world. There was everything to stimulate the development of a national literature which should guide the thoughts of mankind, even as the arms of Spain dominated both hemispheres. The ability of the race was unquestionable, the standard of culture was high, the language had been developed into a copious and flexible

[1] Alcubilla, p. 1591.

vehicle for the expression of thought, and the distinction conferred by successful authorship was a stimulus felt by probably a larger class than in any other country. It was the golden age of Spanish literature and the censorship of its busy presses was a task by no means light.

It will be remembered that the law of 1558, which continued in force until the Constitution of Cadiz in 1812, rendered the supervision of the press a process as cumbrous as it was thorough. Every MS. for which a licence was desired was submitted to the Royal Council; it was then entrusted to an examiner whose duty it was to peruse it carefully and, if found unobjectionable, to give a written approbation which was printed over his signature in front of the work. As the examiner was usually a man of distinction, who served without pay, and who was thus held publicly and morally responsible for any errors which the sharpened eyes of the Inquisition might subsequently discover, it can readily be imagined that his tendency would lean to the side of severity of judgment, even when no private jealousy might lead him to discredit a rival's labors, and the world can never know what valuable contributions to human thought may have thus been suppressed, to the permanent silencing of the discouraged authors. After the MS. had passed this ordeal it was delivered to the *corrector general*, whose duty it was to number every page and to note and rubricate every correction and alteration that might exist in it. When it was through the press this rubricated MS. was returned to the corrector general with a printed copy, and the two were carefully compared to see that no changes had been introduced on the press. Any typographical error was scrupulously noted, and the certificate of its correctness was accompanied by a *Fè de erratas*, all of which was duly printed with the approbation and licence. If the author happened, as generally was the case, to be a member of a religious order a preliminary examination and approbation by his superior was an indis-

pensable prerequisite.[1] Thus the number of official certificates inserted in front of a book is sometimes positively bewildering, especially as the same process had to be repeated in the event of successive editions, whether they were revised or not. All this necessarily required a considerable body of paid officials, whose fees were defrayed by the author or printer, creating a burden which could not but be severely felt by literary men, inadequately rewarded at the best. As the system grew more complex, fees and fines were multiplied, and the censors or examiners who at first served gratuitously were paid salaries which of course were defrayed by the authors, directly or indirectly.[2] As if all this was not sufficient hindrance to authorship, the interests of readers were guarded by accompanying the licence with a *tassa*, or price fixed for the book, arbitrarily determined by the Royal Council, notice of which was to be printed with the other official certificates, and which could not be exceeded. In the earlier times this was generally designated by the rate per sheet in maravedís; in 1598 the scriveners of the Camara were ordered to add to the *fé de la tassa* a computation of the total amount for the volume, but this was generally disregarded and the command was repeated as a novelty in 1752.[3] It was

[1] Autos Acordados, I. vii. 13 (Philip IV. in 1626). Repeated in 1804 by Carlos IV. (Novísima Recop. VIII. xvi. 8).

[2] Autos y Acuerdos del Consejo, Madrid, 1649, fol. 8, Auto xliv.

In 1756 a board of censors was formed consisting of forty men of letters, duly qualified in accordance with the law of Ferdinand and Isabella in 1502, to whom was entrusted the examination of all books presented for licence to print or reprint, and foreign books for licence to sell. For this duty they were to be paid two reals for every sheet of clean, regular MS.; if closely written or illegible the *Juez de Imprentas* decided the extra allowance of sheets to be estimated. For reprints or foreign books the pay was one real per sheet, with allowance for small type or large pages.—Alcubilla, Códigos antiguos de España, p. 1582.

[3] Autos Acordados, I. vii. 6.—Novísima Recop. VIII. xvi. 22, cap. 8.

The earliest books which I have observed with a *tassa* are the *De Ornatu Animæ* of Francisco Ortiz, Alcalá de Henares, 1549, and Part Second of Guevara's *Monte Calvario*, Valladolid, the same year. These bear on the

not until 1762 that the *tassa* was abandoned, for the reason as stated that foreign books are not thus limited in price and it is not just that native ones should be. This happens to offer a curious illustration of Spanish administration, for as early as 1598 it had been ordered that no foreign books should be sold unless they had been *tassados* by the Royal Council, for which purpose a copy was required to be sent to it under pain of forfeiture of the books and a fine of 100,000 maravedís, and moreover in a codification of the press laws made as late as 1752 this provision was retained and the *Juez de Imprentas* was ordered to be zealous in its enforcement. By the law of 1762, however "to check the avarice of booksellers" the *tassa* was retained on books of necessity, which were defined to be books of primary instruction, secular and religious, and books of popular devotion. To insure their sale at the price fixed its notification printed in the book was to be accompanied with a warning that if a bookseller asks more for it or refuses to sell it he shall give it gratuitously to the applicant

title-pages the announcement that the Royal Council had priced them, the former at a real and a half for the volume, the latter at two maravedís the sheet. The rule cannot as yet have been universally established, for the *Armilla Aurea* of Bartolomé Fumo, printed at Medina del Campo in 1552, has no *tassa*. Gomez's Life of Ximenes, a handsome folio, Alcalá, 1569, is taxed at 9 reals for the volume in paper. Cabrera's *Historia de Felipe II.*, folio, Madrid, 1619, is taxed at five maravedís the *pliego* or sheet, and Solorzano's *De Jure Indiarum*, folio, Madrid, 1629, at the same. Gongora's *Historia Apologética de Navarra*, folio, Pamplona, 1627, at three maravedís the *pliego*. Santos's *El no importe*, a small 12mo, Madrid, 1668, at five maravedís the *pliego* or 2 reals 22 maravedís the volume. Gavilan Vela's translation of Mattos's *Breve Discurso contra a Perfidia do Judaismo*, a small 8vo, Madrid, 1680, at seven maravedís the *pliego*. Torrejoncillo's *Centinela contra Judios*, small 18mo, Barcelona, 1731, at 6 maravedís the *pliego*, and the same price for a 12mo novel, *Historia tragica de Leonora y Rosaura*, Madrid, 1736. About the middle of the century the small quartos of the *España Sagrada* are taxed at 8 or 10 maravedís the *pliego* and after 1752 the total for each volume is stated. Even the Indexes themselves are taxed—that of 1559 at one real, that of 1583 at 5 maravedís the *pliego*, that of 1640 at the same.

and shall moreover pay six ducats to the informer and the costs of prosecution.[1]

To attend to the details of this complicated business required an organization extending over the whole land. A member of the Royal Council was delegated as the chief of the censorship, with the title of *Superintendente* or *Ministro* or *Juez de las Imprentas*, with a force of secretaries and subordinates under him. There was a corrector general whose duty it was to collate the printed book with the MS. which had passed the censorship. In the capitals of the various provinces there were local subdelegates with the necessary machinery for the same purpose. These latter were suppressed in 1769 and the duty of administering the press laws was imposed on the presidents of the Chancellerías, the regents of the Audiencias and the corregidores;[2] but they seem to have been shortly afterwards restored, for in 1775, in consequence of the appearance in Murcia of a book entitled *Geográfica Descripcion del África*, without the necessary licence, we find all the *Subdelegados de Imprentas* of the provincial capitals ordered, after making their examination of any book or document, to report the facts to the Royal Council before issuing a licence for the printing—a regulation highly suggestive of the shackles imposed on the book trade and the friction under which authorship was followed.[3] In the revised system adopted by Carlos IV. in 1804 the *Juez de Imprentas* was authorized to appoint subdelegates in all the provincial cap-

[1] Novísima Recop. VIII. xvi. 5, 23, 24; 22 cap. 14.

It was not always easy to enforce the observance of the tassa. The printing of *cartillas* for teaching children to read was a monopoly granted by Philip II. to the cathedral church of Valladolid. They were *tassadas* at four maravedís apiece. In 1594 the Córtes of Madrid complained to Philip that in many places they were sold at 12 or 16 maravedís, and as children destroyed them rapidly this was oppressive on the poor. The king therefore ordered the *justicias* everywhere to see that the lawful price was not exceeded, and to enforce the penalties for infraction.

[2] Novísima Recop. VIII. xvi. 27.

[3] Alcubilla, Códigos antiguos, p. 1580.

itals, with salaries to be defrayed from the duties on foreign books and the fines imposed on printers.[1]

The difficulty which attends all censorship made itself apparent—that the authorities became responsible, directly or indirectly, for everything that appeared in print with the official approbation after passing the official examination. Sometimes they endeavored to escape this responsibility by devices which recognize its existence. In 1625 the *Nobiliario Genealógico de los Reyes y Títulos de Castilla*, by Alonzo Lopez de Haro, after being duly licensed and published in 1622, was ordered to be seized and suppressed; then it was restored to the author with permission to sell it provided that every copy bore at the beginning an *auto* of the Council declaring that the matters contained in it had no authority as proof.[2] Somewhat similar is a cautionary licence prefixed to the *Proceso criminal fulminado contra el Rm. P. M. Fray Froilan Diaz*, published in Madrid in 1788, which permits the issue of the book with a note prefixed in which the Council warns the public not to accord to it more credit than its contents shall be found to deserve. When Valladares undertook the publication of historical documents in his *Semanario Erúdito* the same precaution was deemed necessary, and various volumes of that collection are adorned with notices to that effect.

Thus it was not merely religion and the *regalías* which became the objects of solicitude, but everything which could be construed, directly or indirectly, as affecting the interests of the public or of the State. In the complex responsibility thus established, the Royal Council was incapable of determining all the questions that might be involved in books treating of the most varied subjects. A law of 1682 recites that many and grave inconveniences have arisen from the printing of books, memorials and papers on history, govern-

[1] Novísima Recop. VIII. xvi. 41 cap. 29.

[2] Autos Acordados, I. vii. 12.

ment and the constitution of the State without proper examination; therefore such printing is prohibited for the future until they shall have been submitted to the special Council or Department to whose affairs they relate and whose approbation must be secured before the licence can be issued.[1] All books relating to the Colonies thus underwent the scrutiny of the *Concejo de las Indias* without whose special licence no such work was to be printed, under a fine of 200,000 maravedís and the forfeiture of the printing plant of the offender, which was a most effectual way of preventing the exposure of any abuses in the colonial administration.[2] In 1735, in response to a suggestion from the *Junta de Comercio y Moneda*, every writing on commerce, manufactures, the precious metals and coinage was required to be submitted to that body, whose special licence had to be printed in front of it.[3] This multiplication of authority led occasionally to trouble, as might be

[1] Novísima Recop. VIII. xvi. 10.

[2] Novísima Recop. VIII. xvi. 16.—This regulation was of old standing, and the strictness with which it was enforced is manifested by the licences in front of Solorzano's great work, *De Jure Indiarum*, Madrid, 1629. It was virtually written by royal command, for Philip III. in 1619 approved the plan submitted to him, ordered Solorzano to complete it and granted him leave of absence with salary for two years from his post of judge at Lima—a furlough which in 1621 was extended for six months. When the book was finished Solorzano was himself a member of the Council of the Indies, but his work had to be subjected to the regular formalities. First it has the approval of the Council—"Senatus iccirco noster typis mandari permittit," dated February 9, 1628. Then it is examined by the vicar-general of Madrid and receives his licence, March 30, 1628. Then comes the approbation of Josef Gonzalez, who examined the MS. by order of the Royal Council, June 5, 1628. The book could now be printed, and finally on March 18, 1629, the corrector general issued his certificate that he had compared the print with the MS. and found the errors, of which he gives the usual list.

Very similar are the approbations and licences prefixed to Solis's *Historia de la Conquista de Mexico*. Solis was royal chronicler for the Indies, but his book was examined first for the episcopal vicar of Madrid and licensed by him; then for the Council of the Indies and licensed by it; then for the Royal Council which issued the licence to print; after which follow the *fé de erratas* and the *tassa*—the dates extending from May 24, 1683, to December 5, 1684.

[3] Novísima Recop. VIII. xvi. 15.

expected. In 1786 the subdelegate of Valencia, by order of the Intendente, endeavored to prevent the printing of a discourse on a new method of growing rice which had been approved by the *Junta de Comercio*, whereupon Carlos III. issued an order prohibiting the Royal Council from interfering, directly or indirectly, with publications approved by the Junta on matters within its competence.[1] The subjects of human interest are too various and too closely interlaced to be readily subjected to a rude classification such as was attempted, and the different departments were constantly liable to doubts as to their powers, which must have exposed authorship to innumerable delays and perils. In 1744 Philip V. forbade the Royal Council from granting licences for works on affairs of state, treaties of peace and the like, applications for which he ordered to be made directly to himself. The definition of the prohibited subjects was a trifle vague, and two years afterwards there appeared, with the Council's licence, a treatise on maritime captures, which the king construed to come within the purview of his order, whereupon he commanded its more rigid observance and warned the *Ministro de Imprentas*.[2] In 1762 the precaution was extended to second editions of books on matters affecting the State, which were not to be permitted without an express royal licence issued through the first Secretary of State. Even the reprinting of the supplements of the official Gazette containing state documents was prohibited in 1775, and some which had appeared were seized and suppressed. The treaty of peace with France in 1795 was reprinted in Barcelona, Pampeluna, Saragossa, and Malaga, whereupon Carlos IV. ordered that only those issued by the royal printing office should be circulated. Nothing printed by royal order was to be re-

[1] Alcubilla, Códigos Antiguos, p. 1579.

[2] Novísima Recop. VIII. xvi. 17.—Alcubilla, p. 1579.—The work which excited the royal wrath was doubtless the *Tratado jurídico-político sobre presas de mar*, by Felipe Joseph Abreu y Bertodano, Cadiz, 1746.

printed under pain of 500 ducats for the first offence, 1000 for the second and deprivation of office for the third.[1]

It is no wonder that Spain fell hopelessly behind in the development of literature, science, commerce and industry when human thought seeking expression was surrounded and rendered inarticulate by so many impediments. It was repressed with a perverse minuteness of ingenuity that now seems incredible. Paternalism in government with its perpetual and benumbing intermeddling could scarce be carried further. In 1757 Fernando VI. issued a law, repeated in 1778 by Carlos III., which recited the evils arising from medical works not properly scrutinized, wherefore in future the *Juez de Imprentas* was ordered to see that all such books, besides the examination of the official censors, should have the approbation of a physician selected by the President of the *Protomedicato*, or body which examined and licensed students.[2] It would have been difficult to devise a more effective means of throttling the progress of medical science. So keen was the responsibility felt for everything appearing in print with the official licence that no maps containing any portion of the Spanish boundaries could be printed without a special report by the Real Academia de la Historia, which was to be transmitted directly to the king.[3]

The microscopic supervision of the press in its minutest details was carried to the furthest extreme. A law of Philip IV. in 1627 directs that all legal papers shall be signed by the counsel or fiscal and shall contain nothing unnecessarily offensive. No letters or apologies, or panegyrics, or gazettes, or news, or papers on state affairs, or verses, or dialogues, or other matters, even if only consisting of a few lines, shall be printed in Madrid without the approbation of a member of the Royal Council nominated as commissioner for the purpose with power to appoint deputies; in other towns the chanceries

[1] Novísima Recop. VIII. xvi. 18.
[2] Novísima Recop. VIII. xvi. 20.
[3] Novísima Recop. VIII. xvi. 21.

or courts or *justicias* shall depute the duty to suitable persons. Any printer, binder, or bookseller concerned in getting out printed matter without such licence, or with supposititious or fraudulent names or imprints, shall, for a first offence, suffer a fine of 50,000 maravedís and two years' exile; for a second, double, and for a third total confiscation and perpetual banishment, the fines being suggestively divided between the informer, the judge and the treasury.[1] In 1648 there was a complaint that memorials to the king were printed which were not simple statements of services, but contained discussions on political or other matters—an ingenious evasion of the censorship which was stopped by requiring, under pain of condign punishment, the licence of the *Juez de Imprentas* for the printing of all such documents.[2] In 1692 the printers of Madrid were ordered to print no memorials, fly-sheets, or other papers of any kind, without licence from the *Superintendente general de las Impressiones*, under a fine of 2000 ducats and six years' exile.[3] In 1705 this law was extended to printers everywhere, with a penalty of 500 ducats, ten years of *Presidio* and other severe punishment.[4] In 1728 the order was repeated that no paper, however brief, should be printed without preliminary examination and licence, and to insure the observance of this a monthly statement from all Spain of every paper (except legal documents) with the subject and name of author, was required to be made to the king through the Secretary of State.[5] In the codification of the press laws in 1752 it was provided that no memorial or loose paper of any kind or size, even if only a few lines,

[1] Novísima Recop. VIII. xvi. 9. I am inclined to think that in this as in so many other matters the laws were most negligently enforced. In looking over a number of Spanish pamphlets, issued between 1624 and 1652, only one has a formal approbation and seems to have undergone the prescribed process. One has a licence granted by the municipal authorities of Córdoba. The rest content themselves with simply "Con Licencia" on the title-page. There was evidently great laxity of administration.

[2] Autos Acordados, I. vii. 15.

[3] Autos Acordados, I. vii. 19.

[4] Novísima Recop. VIII. xvi. 11.

[5] Novísima Recop. VIII. xvi. 14.

except notes of invitation or the like, should be printed unless it had been presented to the Royal Council and duly licensed, under pain of 2000 ducats and six years' exile. Even legal papers, signed by counsel, which formerly were exempt, had been utilized, in the general repression, as vehicles for satires and defamatory statements, and by a law of 1749, repeated in 1752, were required to have the licence of the Council, or of the tribunal before which the case was pending.[1] Under such restrictions and impediments the transactions of commerce and even the daily business of life was carried on under the most serious disadvantages, and it is easy to understand how Spain fell behind in the race with freer countries when this spirit pervaded the nation and repressed its energies.

Of course all this implied the close supervision of printing offices and book-shops by a host of officials, with power to inflict infinite vexation as the alternative of extortion. Printers and booksellers, in fact, were practically outlawed, for a law of 1692 deprived them of their *fueros* or municipal rights and placed them under the sole jurisdiction of the *Superintendente de Imprentas*, or of his subdelegates, under the plea that if the inspectors were to be accompanied by the consuls of the town or other officials there would be a likelihood of notice in advance with opportunity of concealing contraband articles.[2] The crown could deprive its subjects of their civil rights, but it dared not meddle with ecclesiastical privileges. There were printing offices in religious houses—the printing of the millions of bulls of the *santa cruzada* was performed in convents and we have seen that the Cathedral of Valladolid had the monopoly of printing *cartillas* or primers

[1] Novísima Recop VIII. xvi. 19, 22 cap. 1, 6.

[2] Novísima Recop. VIII. xvi. 2.—It is somewhat suggestive of the mysteries of Spanish administration that in the codified press-law of 1752 this is twice alluded to and printers are forbidden to impede the entrance of the superintendent or his delegates unless they have orders from a higher quarter to obstruct the examination (Ibid. ley 22 cap. 7, 16).

—and the censorship dared not invade the sacred precincts. Whether advantage was taken of this to do unlicensed printing surreptitiously I do not know, but the existence of such offices was a weakness in the system. Accordingly a law of 1766, repeated in 1804, directs that to remove the abuse of printing offices established by privileged bodies or persons, no such office shall exist in a convent or other privileged place. All such shall be sold or rented to laymen within two months and be removed from the privileged enclosure; moreover no manager of an office shall be an ecclesiastic, for all persons responsible for its conduct must be amenable to the royal jurisdiction.[1]

The natural result of this repressive system was the depression of the printing business, which declined and deteriorated while that of the rest of Europe was constantly developing and improving. A comparison of the productions of the presses of Spain and France during the seventeenth century shows how inferior the former had become, although in the preceding century they had been virtually on an equality. It was doubtless partly on this account and partly to escape the rigor of censorship that many Spanish writers came to have their books printed abroad. As early as 1610 this had grown to proportions sufficient to call for the most rigorous repression. A law of that date provides that anyone so doing, without special royal licence, all who aid him in the transaction, and anyone attempting to import books so printed, shall forfeit their citizenship and any honor or dignity which they may hold, besides half their property, applicable in thirds to the informer, the judge and the treasury. Of course all copies of such books were confiscated.[2] This was followed in 1617 by a further provision that no licences for such purpose should be granted and if granted they should be void, and persons attempting to import books under them should forfeit the books and incur a fine of

[1] Novísima Recop. VIII. xv. 5.

[2] Novísima Recop. VIII. xvi 7.

50,000 maravedís.[1] In the codification of 1752 this takes the shape of a prohibition to import or sell any books in Spanish, written by Spaniards and printed abroad, without special royal licence, under penalty of death and confiscation —but the death-penalty is commuted to four years of *Presidio*, with augmentation for repetition of offence.[2]

For a considerable period the domains of the crown of Aragon were not legally subject to this insane medley of meddlesome legislation. Aragon, Catalonia and Valencia had succeeded in maintaining much of their ancient liberty and in escaping the centralized absolutism of Castile. Their freedom as regards censorship was rather nominal than real, however, for, as we have seen, no books could cross the Castilian frontier which had not been subjected to the Castilian regulations, and as Castile was the larger market the presses of Saragossa, Barcelona and Valencia must perforce have adapted themselves to the necessities of trade. But in local matters at least they were comparatively free, and it was doubtless for lack of an efficient censorship in Barcelona that in 1640 and 1642 Philip IV. called on the Inquisition, whose jurisdiction extended everywhere, to condemn the Catalan manifestos.

[1] Autos Acordados, I. vii. 8.

Picatoste (La Grandeza y Decadenza de España, Madrid, 1887, T. III. pp. 169-70) says that by the commencement of the seventeenth century there were in Spain but eight or ten printing offices in Madrid and three or four in Seville, but this is an evident mistake, for there were presses busy in Barcelona, Valencia, Saragossa, Pampeluna, Cuenca and Toledo. The subjection of books to the *alcavala*, or ten per cent. tax on sales, was a heavy burden, till it was removed in 1636, after a struggle in which Doctor Blas González de Rivero showed that including all imposts the taxes on books amounted to 50 per cent., and he asserted that during the previous thirty years the printing offices in Spain had decreased by one-half.

In spite of the law of 1610 the printing of Spanish books abroad continued. Picatoste tells us that foreign printers sent their agents to Spain to make contracts with authors, and the books were smuggled into the country.

[2] Novísima Recop. VIII. xvi. 22, cap. 13.

Thus in the Aragonese kingdoms the ferocious laws of Philip II. and his successors had no currency, and the preliminary censorship remained in the hands of the bishops, while of course anything heretical which escaped their vigilance was liable after publication to condemnation at the hands of the Inquisition, and the Index was everywhere in force. Originally the bishops, as the guardians of religion, were the natural censors to prevent the dissemination of heresy, but the law of 1558 had charged them, under the crown of Castile, merely with the supervision of books of ritual and education, and this was construed in 1773 as defining the limitation of their censorship; they ought to be consulted on questions of dogma, but were warned that they must not use the expression "imprimatur" or any other implying jurisdiction.[1] In Aragon their functions remained undisturbed. The Córtes of Aragon doubtless refused to adopt the law of 1558, and as the next best thing, in 1565 the provincial council of Valencia organized a complete episcopal censorship. No book was to be printed in future unless approved by the Ordinary or by examiners of his appointment, and this approbation was to be printed in front of the work. The possession or sale of prohibited or heretical books

[1] Novísima Recop. VIII. xvi. 3 cap. 4; VIII. xvi. 28. Still there are occasional evidences of episcopal jurisdiction, as in the approbation of Solorzano's *De Jure Indiarum* and Solis's *Historia de la Conquista de México*, alluded to above. In the indignant vindication of the *Regalistas* by Philip IV. in 1647, also, the episcopal approbation of their works is adduced as a proof of their orthodoxy.

An auto of 1624 provides that all works written or translated by members of the religious orders shall require the approbation of their superiors and also of the episcopal ordinary of the diocese.—Autos y Acuerdos del Consejo, Madrid, 1649, fol. 60, Auto ccxxxiii.

The ecclesiastics seem to have complained that the law of 1773 restricted their rights as defined by the Council of Trent (Sess. IV. *de edit. et usu Sacror. Libror.*). In 1778 Carlos III. admitted that they could use the power thus bestowed to license sacred books, but these were not to be printed until after submission to the Royal Council to see that they contained nothing adverse to the royal prerogative (Novís. Recop. VIII. xvi. 29).

was likewise assumed to be under episcopal jurisdiction; the books were to be burnt and the offender excommunicated, and for a repetition of the offence the Ordinary was directed to prosecute him for suspicion of heresy.[1] The whole business was treated as exclusively an episcopal function and there is no mention of any duties devolving upon the State or the Inquisition. This continued to be the practice. Even the opportunity afforded to Philip II. after suppressing the rebellion of Antonio Perez in 1591 worked no change in this respect except to require the formal licence of the royal representative. The Córtes of Taragona, assembled in 1592 to ratify Philip's demands, deplored the evils hitherto endured in Aragon from the freedom of the press and decreed for the future heavy penalties against those who should print books without express licence from the king or the president of the Audiencia.[2] There were no regulations provided for the enforcement of the censorship and the press must have continued busy, for the Córtes of Monçon in 1599 say that there are many paper mills, capable of producing most of the paper used, but their business is interfered with by the Genoese and others who carry away the rags—*los draps sotils que surveixen pera fer dits papers*—wherefore the export of rags is forbidden for the future.[3] The Aragonese books of this period are

[1] Concil. Valentin. ann. 1565, Sess. I. c. iii. (Aguirre V. 413).

[2] Córtes de Taragona, año de 1592, Ley 18 (Herrera, Relacion de los Movimientos de Aragon, Madrid, 1612, p. 131).

There is no allusion to these laws in the *Actos de Cortes del Reyno de Aragon*, Çaragoça, 1664.

[3] Capitols y Actes de Cort, cap. 88 (Barcelona, 1603, fol. lii.).

The Catalan paper mills continued to enjoy a high reputation, but their activity which in 1599 was so great as to require the prohibition of rag exportation must have greatly declined with the rigor of censorship. In the latter part of the seventeenth century we find Genoese papers largely used in the royal chancery (Briquet, Papiers et Filigranes des Archives de Gênes, Genève, 1888, p. 84). It must have been for the purpose of securing them a market rather than for the assumed object of improving the quality of book-production, that the codified press law of 1752 requires all printing to be done on fine paper like that of the mills of Capellades (near Barcelona, renowned

therefore mostly devoid of the long series of certificates and approbations and licences with which the Castilian publications are encumbered. The bishop or his ordinary orders an examination, the examiner reports favorably and the episcopal approbation suffices, or, after 1592, the royal representative issues a licence on the strength of it; the *tassa*, or limitation of price, is also lacking; there was nominally a subsequent collation of the MS. and printed sheets, but as there is no accompanying *fé de erratas*, it probably was not enforced.[1]

This continued until the advent of the Bourbon dynasty. The War of Succession afforded an opportunity to destroy the liberties of the Aragonese kingdoms. By an edict of 1707 Philip V. united them to the crown of Castile and abolished their *fueros* "by right of conquest," but it was not until 1714 that the desperate resistance of Catalonia was overcome and he could organize the new régime of absolutism. In the reign of terror which ensued he founded the Audiencia of Catalonia, which was a sort of Aulic Council, with the Captain General, the Marquis of Ciudad-Rodrigo, at its head, clothed with legislative, judicial and executive functions, and responsible only to the supreme authority in Madrid. Its members were nearly all strangers, ignorant of the very language of the land.[2] It was the same in Aragon and Valencia, and in the

for their product) and not on what is called printing paper, under pain of 50 ducats and forfeiture of the books, with increased penalties for repetition of offence (Novís. Recop. VIII. xvi. 22 cap. 12). This seems to have been difficult to enforce and was repeated in 1753 and 1755, with provision for the inspection of all offices (Alcubilla, Códigos antiguos, p. 1581).

[1] In 1582 the *Canones Pœnitentiales* of Antonio Agostino, Archbishop of Tarragona, are duly submitted to his vicar-general, who certifies that he has had the book examined by the Rev. Doctor Bartolomé Roca and grants licence for printing and selling. In 1602 Çamora's *Monarchia Mistica de la Iglesia* has an *aprovacion* by the examiner to whom the work was entrusted by the vicar-general of the see, followed by a licence issued by Cardinal Ascanio Colonna, Viceroy and Captain General of Aragon, based on the examination by the Ordinary. How purely formal this was is seen by the licence being dated four days earlier than the approbation.

[2] Autos Acordados, III. ii. 3.—Bofarull y Broca, Historia de Cataluña, T. IX. pp. 205, 207.

following November the Castilian censorship was extended over them all. Licences for printing and publication were required to be applied for to the Royal Council at Madrid; but "to avoid injurious delays," especially when the authors were residents of the subjugated kingdoms, they were mercifully spared the necessity of having the printed copy compared with the rubricated MS. by the corrector general at Madrid. The Audiencias of Saragossa, Barcelona and Valencia were authorized to appoint correctors for their respective provinces, who were to have oversight of all books printed in them, and were to make diligent inspection of the printing offices. As for papers and other loose documents, not books, licences were to be applied for to the respective Audiencias.[1] By way of clearing the land of all dangerous and seditious matter, preparatory to the operation of the censorship, in 1717 Castel-Rodrigo issued an edict declaring guilty of high treason every one who should not surrender all books, pamphlets, poetry, etc. written in Catalonia between 1705 and 1714, and in the following year further edicts of the same nature were published.[2] In 1735 the routine established in the three kingdoms of Aragon was that the licence of the Royal Council at Madrid was first obtained; after printing, the copy was compared with the rubricated MS. by a person named by the Audiencia (usually the original examiner who had approved the work); his sworn statement of the list of errata and number of sheets was sent to the corrector general in Madrid, and on his certificate the government secretary of the kingdom in question issued his certificate of the *tassa*, which was given to the parties interested on their engaging to deliver the requisite number of copies to the Royal Council.[3] This routine was preserved in the codified law of 1752[4] and the cumber-

[1] Autos Acordados, I. vii. 26, 27. Repeated by Carlos IV., December 18, 1804 (Novís. Recop. VIII. xvi. 13).

[2] Bofarull y Broca, T. IX. pp. 211, 212.

[3] Autos Acordados, I. vii. Glossa 1.

[4] Novísima Recop. VIII. xvi. 22 cap. 19.

some process doubtless did its share in repressing the intellectual activity of the three kingdoms. It happened that in 1772 there appeared in Barcelona a work on the Aristotelian philosophy bearing a licence from the episcopal vicar general as well as from the royal audiencia. This harmless revival of the old Aragonese system in pure surplusage aroused the susceptibilities of the crown and gave rise to the decree of 1773, referred to above, forbidding for the future all assumption of episcopal power to license books.[1]

Navarre, which had been conquered by Ferdinand in 1512, came earlier under complete subjection to the Castilian crown. In 1569 there would appear to be still a measure of independence, for a law of Philip II. says that without examination and licence by the Royal Council no books of ritual shall be imported into Castile, "even if printed in Aragon, Valencia, Catalonia or Navarre."[2] By 1613 there must have been organized a complete local system of censorship, based upon Philip's law of 1558, for in a book of that date, published at Pampeluna, the approbation, licence, *tassa*, and *fé de erratas* show that the Council of Navarre was clothed with authority in that kingdom similar to that of the Royal Council in Castile, and that the prescribed routine of examination, licence to print, comparison of printed text with MS. and regulation of price was followed. The dates of the several documents, however, would seem to prove that the business was performed in a perfunctory manner and rather with the object of securing the fees than of preserving the faithful from error.[3] Yet Navarre preserved the semblance of its independent institutions and in 1783 a law of its Córtes called

[1] Machicado et Villarna Additiones Hispanicæ ad Biblioth. Ferraris, Matriti, 1783, p. 298.

[2] Novísima Recop. VIII. xvi. 4.

[3] Guadalajara y Xavierr, Expulsion de los Moriscos, Pamplona, 1613. The *Historia Apologética de Navarra*, by Gongora y Torreblanca, Pamplona, 1628, shows the same routine duly observed.

forth an edict of Carlos III. regulating the whole subject. The Council of Navarre was recognized as having the same powers as that of Castile and was to license books under the same regulations, but books refused licence in Castile were not to be licensed in Navarre, for which purpose correspondence must be kept up between the fiscals of the two Councils. The censorship of the bishops of Navarre was to be limited to that exercised by those of Castile. There was to be free trade in books between the two kingdoms and unlawful editions of books "privileged," or copyrighted, were not to be allowed.[1]

THE REVOLUTION.

The enlightened Carlos III. desired to lighten the burdens and remove the shackles which oppressed the literature of Spain without relaxing the control of authority. We have seen how, in 1768, he imposed limits on the arbitrary censorship of the Inquisition, and in 1763 he had already endeavored to simplify that of the State and render it less onerous. In addition to the removal of the *tassa*, alluded to above, he ordered that the first licence, *para imprimir y vender*, should suffice and the second, *para publicar y vender*, should no longer be necessary. This did away with a cumbrous and expensive process, the cause of no little delay, and consequently the office of corrector general, with its fees and share of fines, was abolished. The special *portero*, or messenger of the Royal Council employed in the censorship, was likewise suppressed, and all persons were authorized to apply personally or by their agents to the Council for licences—a permission suggestive of the exactions which had previously flourished. The payment made to the censors or examiners

[1] Novísima Recop. VIII. xvi. 30.

of books was declared exorbitant and oppressive, and they were required to serve gratuitously, save an honorary copy of the book examined, the honor of being employed in a service so distinguished being pronounced sufficient, as it was elsewhere in Europe. Approbations and licences were no longer to be printed in books, but simply a statement that they had been approved and had the necessary licence; commendatory letters from friends were also prohibited.[1] In 1769, as we have seen, he suppressed the subdelegates of the censorship in the provincial capitals; and, with the object of encouraging the book trade, he forbade the importation of all books which were printed or reprinted in Spain. In 1778 he congratulated himself on the result of this legislation as shown in the flourishing condition of the printing business, so necessary for the development of the sciences and useful arts, and he made changes in the regulations concerning privileges with a view to facilitate the reproduction of books.[2] As a further stimulus to book-manufacture he prohibited the importation of any books of later date than 1700 except in paper covers. The Spanish binders were to have the full advantage of the home market, and only old books and MSS. bound outside of Spain could be introduced into the land.[3]

At the same time Carlos III. was as firmly persuaded as his predecessors of the necessity of controlling the press, and he did not hestitate when he thought necessary to adopt the most energetic measures to protect the prerogative and the faith. In 1770 he rendered the censorship more burdensome

[1] Novísima Recop. VIII. xvi. 24. The overgrown approbations had become an abuse. The censors would frequently write long and effusive panegyrics to display their own learning. In the *España Sagrada* of Florez the approbations and licences of Vol. IV. occupy 26 quarto pages, and those of Vol. VI. 24 pages.

[2] Novísima Recop. VIII. xvi. 26, 27.—Alcubilla, p. 1582.

[3] Sanchez, Extracto Puntual de todas las Pragmáticas, Cédulas, etc. de Carlos III., Madrid, 1792, T. II. p. 19.—Archivo Municipal de Sevilla, Sevilla, 1860, T. I. Carpeta XI. No. 272.

by increasing its centralization, on occasion of a book published at Valencia entitled "Puntos de disciplina eclesiástica propuestos á los Señores Sacerdotes." This was prohibited as false and satirical, damaging to the royal prerogative and disturbing the harmony between the secular and clerical authorities. For the future all presidents and corregidores of the Audiencias, Chancillerías and cities were forbidden to license any books or papers treating directly or indirectly on the powers and jurisdiction of Church or State, or on matters of government, but were to send all such to the Royal Council.[1] His special wrath was excited by Louis Sebastien Mercier's "L'an deux mille quatre cent quarante. Rève s'il en fût jamais"—a philosophical anticipation of the future which had a phenomenal success throughout Europe. It was condemned in Rome in 1773, and in 1778 Carlos denounced it in a special royal cédula in the bitterest terms as a mortal pest, subversive of all social order. All copies were ordered to be burnt by the executioner and their further importation was strictly prohibited. The Inquisition had been ordered to condemn it and had obediently hastened to do so, reserving, however, a single copy, to be kept in the royal library.[2] So, when the importation of Diderot's *Encyclopédie* called attention to the neglect of the regulations requiring a licence for the importation of all foreign books, Carlos ordered the strict enforcement of the law of Ferdinand and Isabella of 1502. All books were required to be stopped at the port of entry until submitted to the Royal Council and a licence issued for them; and all subsequent importations were to be examined to see that no alterations had been made in them.[3]

[1] Novísima Recop. VIII. xviii. 9.

[2] Index Leonis XIII. p. 10.—Novísima Recop. VIII. xviii. 10.—Índice Último, p. 9.

[3] Novísima Recop. VIII. xvi. 31. This cédula was promptly followed by a list of books stopped at the custom house and submitted to the Royal Council, which replied that all old and well-known books should be passed, while those which appeared to be new or altered should be held until copies were

Perhaps the most significant indication of the liberalizing tendency of the period was the relaxation of the prohibition of the Scriptures in the vernacular. In 1757 the Congregation of the Index conceded the use of such versions, if approved by the Holy See and edited with comments from the holy fathers or learned Catholic men.[1] The first advantage taken of this permission seems to have been by the Canon Alberto Catenacci, who in 1771 issued a translation of the Acts of the Apostles, dedicated to Clement XIV. and bearing the *imprimatur* of Ricchini, the Master of the Sacred Palace.[2] This was followed in 1778 by the brief *In tanta librorum*, in which Pius VI. approved of the translation by Antonio Martini, Archbishop of Florence, of the whole Bible with its commentaries which carefully preserved the uninstructed reader from being misled by the inspired writings. As twenty years had elapsed since the decree of the Congregation, this took the conservatives of Rome by surprise and excited much animadversion—indeed, some of those who had always upheld the absolute authority of the Holy See and its claim to blind obedience did not hesitate to say that the papal brief ought

submitted and examined. Three months later an order was issued that, to prevent damage from detention at ports which were damp, books intended for Madrid could be forwarded to the *douane* there; of those intended for residents at the ports and elsewhere official lists should be forwarded by the government scriveners, specifying author and date and place of edition (Alcubilla, Códigos antiguos, p. 1584).—Like all other similar regulations these were speedily neglected.

[1] Index Benedicti XIV. p. vi.

[2] Atti Apostolici con varie note tradotti dal Canonico Alberto Catenacci . . . dedicati alla Santitá di Nostro Signore Papa Clemente XIV. In Roma, 1771, Con Licenza de' Superiori.

The text of the Vulgate and the Italian version are given in parallel columns. The notes are moderate in length. Fra Agostino Giorgi, the censor to whose examination Ricchini committed the work, says of it "e poichè così, com 'egli è tradotto, corresponde esattamente al *Testo latino della Volgata*, e nel resto nulla ha che si opponga alla nostra santa Cattolica Religione e alle regole della Chiesa, io lo reputo, e utilissimo per la comune istruzione de' Fedeli, e degno per ogni titolo delle pubbliche stampe."

to be denounced to the Inquisition and that it contained false and erroneous propositions which Pius should be forced to recant.[1] Nevertheless, Spain soon followed the example of the pope. In 1782, the inquisitor general, Felipe Bertran, Bishop of Salamanca, issued a decree in which he declared that, although ample cause had existed for extending Rule V. of the Spanish Index beyond the Tridentine Rule IV., still, as those causes had ceased to exist, and in view of the utility to be derived by the faithful from versions of the sacred text hitherto prohibited, it had been, after mature deliberation, resolved to modify the rule to the precise terms of that of Trent, and make it conform to the decree of the Congregation of the Index of 1757 and the brief of Pius VI. approving Martini's version. This was accordingly incorporated in the Rules of tne Index of 1790, and Spanish versions of the Bible, properly annotated, after nearly two hundred and fifty years of prohibition, were again rendered lawful.[2] The prohibition had lasted so long and had been so rigidly enforced that many people had come to regard it as an article of faith and not of discipline and anticipated the apostasy of the people as a probable consequence of rescinding it. There was wide-spread and deep-seated disapprobation, to remove which Dr. Joaquin Lorenzo Villanueva, himself a *calificador* of the Inquisition, wrote a learned folio volume on the subject which has every appearance of being inspired, or at least suggested, by the Holy Office. He traced the practice of the Church with relation to Scripture from the beginning; he showed that the greater number of heresies

[1] Villanueva, De la Leccion de la Sagrada Escritura, Prólogo.

[2] Villanueva, p. 95.—Índice Último, p. xvii.—Possibly this decree of the Inquisition may have been brought about by the preparation of a Spanish version of the Bible by Scio de San Miguel, with a voluminous commentary, which appeared in Valencia the same year, 1790, in ten folio volumes. There was little danger that so ponderous a work would have an extended circulation among the people, but it seems to have met a popular want, for an edition in eight folios followed in 1791 and another in nineteen quartos in 1797. It still holds its place and has been reprinted in 1843, 1846, 1852, 1858 and 1864.

had arisen from among the learned and the priesthood, so that if the arguments for depriving the people of the Bible are good they would justify its withholding in the Latin from the clergy; he pointed out that there was no longer any intellectual activity or independence likely to cause danger—the people were submissive and no one thought of opposing his private opinion to the tradition and authority of the Church; he devoted successive chapters to the benefits derivable from reading and studying Scripture—to those who search it with humility and trust in God it is the Book of Life, it makes men good citizens and is the firmest support of the State—and he winds up with an eloquent exhortation to all to avail themselves of the permission conceded. No Protestant could dwell with greater warmth upon the duty of assiduously searching the Scriptures and upon its beneficent influence on heart and soul.[1] That such a book should be written under the auspices of the Spanish Inquisition was in itself a phenomenon of the utmost significance.[2]

It was while Villanueva was rounding his periods to show that there was no longer danger to be anticipated from the

[1] Villanueva, Prólogo; pp. 66, 200-1; cap. xxiv., xxv., xxvi., xxvii.

Menendez y Pelayo (II. 189) qualifies Villanueva as a Jansenist, but admits that his work on the Bible is "sólido, ortodoxo y eruditísimo," and that the attacks which it drew upon him were rather violent than reasonable. Under his maternal name of Lorenzo Astengo, Villanueva in 1798 published the "Cartas de un Presbítero Español," an earnest defence of the Inquisition against Bishop Grégoire of Blois. Notwithstanding this, he was thrown in prison during the reaction under Fredinand VII. and a pamphlet containing a speech of his in the Córtes of Cadiz was placed on the Index by the Inquisitorial edict of 1815 (Walton's Translation of Puigblanch's Inquisition Unmasked, London, 1816, Vol. I. p. xli.).

[2] How complete has been the change in the policy of the Church respecting the vernacular Scriptures is seen in the Pastoral Letter of the prelates assembled, in 1884, in the Council of Baltimore—"It can hardly be necessary for us to remind you, beloved brethren, that the most highly valued treasure of every family library, and the most frequently and lovingly made use of, should be the Holy Scriptures" (Acta et Decreta Concilii Plenarii Baltimorensis Tertii, Baltimoræ, 1886, p. lxxxix.). The version recommended is the Douai, with appropriate commentaries.

spirit of inquiry and independence that events were rapidly developing which were to check Spanish liberalism and bring about a reaction more rigid than ever. Carlos III. died in 1788 and his bigoted and narrow-minded son and successor, Carlos IV. was left to face the menacing portents of the Revolution of '89. As the monarchy crumbled in France, his anxiety to exclude from his dominions all inflammatory matter became more and more urgent. As early as December 13, 1789, the Inquisition issued an edict commanding the surrender of all papers coming from France and conveying revolutionary ideas.[1] One prohibition followed another in quick succession. The Inquisition declared all works of modern philosophy to be heretical, and in the annual Edict of Denunciations required everyone to inform against those who read them.[1] Everything provocative of sedition was sedulously barred out ; if received, the civil power as well as the Inquisition ordered the possessor forthwith to surrender it and divulge the name of the sender. Prints representing the events in France were especially dreaded and were ordered seized at the ports of entry. In 1790 a French traveller wearing a waistcoat ornamented in squares, each containing a horse at full speed with the legend *Liberté*, excited the gravest apprehension. He was arrested and a royal order forbade the admission of such waistcoats or of any articles conveying references to the troubles in France. In August, 1792, a cédula commanded that all pamphlets and papers, printed and MSS., treating of the Revolution should be seized at the custom houses and sent to Madrid ; all snuff-boxes, fans, ribbons and other matters bearing allusions to it were to be sent to the *Ministerio de Hacienda*, where the obnoxious figures and inscriptions should be removed before delivery to the owners. All French books destined for Madrid were to

[1] MSS. of David Fergusson, Esq I find in this year a case of a Bachiller Gerónimo Caro prosecuted by the Inquisition of Mexico for keeping and reading prohibited books.

[2] Llorente, IV. 99.

be sent thither under seal, and those for other places were to be examined at the port of entry by special agents instructed to retain all that bore upon the forbidden topic. Two months later a still more stringent order was issued, by which a commissioner of the Inquisition was adjoined to the royal agent in the examination of all books arriving from France, and minute instructions were given as to their separation into permissible, prohibited and doubtful—the latter to be detained until the royal decision could be had. In 1793 repeated orders forbade any allusion, favorable or unfavorable, to French affairs in books and newspapers. In September of the same year copies of a Spanish version of the French constitution were discovered in Barcelona and it was reported that 3000 had been printed for the Spanish market, which caused a fresh agitation and strict prohibition. This policy of suppressing all knowledge of affairs beyond the Pyrenees was vigorously maintained. In 1799 a work was seized, printed at Malaga, entitled "Persecucion del clero y de la Iglesia en Francia," and in 1800 two books on Napoleon's expedition to Egypt.[1]

Of course it was impossible to enforce absolutely these prohibitions. Bourgoing assures us that during the Revolution and even during the war, the Spaniards procured French journals in spite of all the efforts of the authorities.[2] Llorente tells us that the arrests for such offences were numerous, especially among the students of Valladolid and Salamanca.[3] A law of 1798 deplores the cupidity which led the booksellers to circulate forbidden books, diffusing a poison which made itself apparent even in the literary transactions of universities and academies. The offenders are threatened with the most rigorous application of the law and are told not to permit in their shops conversations tending to subvert the political

[1] Novísima Recop. VIII. xviii. 11–14.—Alcubilla, pp. 1593–4.
[2] Tableau de l'Espagne Moderne, Paris, 1803, I. 313.
[3] Llorente, IV. 99.

order.[1] The offence was a purely political one, but under the time-honored system of censorship its punishment was still in the hands of the Inquisition. In 1799 two booksellers of Valladolid, Mariano and Raymon de Santander, were prosecuted by it for having sold some prohibited books and were condemned to defray the expenses of the trials, to two months' confinement in a convent and to perpetual banishment to a distance of eight leagues from Valladolid, Madrid and all other royal residences, which was virtually equivalent to ruin.[2] In spite of unrelaxing effort the evil was incurable. In 1802 Carlos complains that even the indefatigable zeal of the Inquisition is insufficient to prevent irreparable damage to religion from the importation of wicked books, but his only resource is to order a more rigid enforcement of the law with a threat of increased penalties.[3] It was not the fault of the government if the Spanish people were not kept in absolute ignorance of the events which were transforming Europe, and were not thus sedulously rendered unfit to meet the crisis impending over them.

During this period increased solicitude was naturally aroused by that essential feature of modern civilization, journalism. In a nation doomed by its rulers to obscurantism the growth of the newspaper had necessarily been slow. The first Madrid journal appeared in 1661 and in 1677 there was created the office of *gacetero*, clothed with absolute power over the licensing of gazettes and their contents, in addition to which they were subject to examination before publication by the Royal Council.[4] This was not likely to stimulate their growth and by 1738 their number had increased to only two. From this date to 1761 there were three, but in 1763 there

[1] Novísima Recop. VIII. xviii. 16.

[2] Llorente, IV. 122.

[3] Novísima Recop. VIII. xvi. 32.

[4] Diario de Noticias (Coleccion de Documentos inéditos, T. LXVII. p. 120).

were nine. This was too rapid a development, and between 1763 and 1786 the number fluctuated between six and two, but in 1786 it rose to eight and in 1787 to ten; it was ruthlessly cut down by Carlos IV., but increased to seven in 1804 and to eight in 1808.[1] When we think of the "North Briton," of which "Number 45" appeared in 1763, and of the Letters of Junius between 1768 and 1772, we can measure the difference between the artificially created torpor of Spain and the native vigor of England, and we can estimate the influence of institutions upon national character and development.

The first formal appearance of periodical literature in Spanish legislation occurs in a law of Carlos III. in 1785. From this and subsequent enactments we can gather that hitherto no distinction had been drawn between journals and books, except that a general licence to issue the periodical had to be applied for. When this was granted, the MS. for each number was submitted to the Royal Council and on being approved was put in type. The printed copy and MS. then went before the corrector general for comparison, and when he was satisfied that no alteration had been made, permission to publish and sell was given. It is easy to understand the slow development of journalism, subjected to such restrictions and delays. By the law of 1785 periodicals were put under the exclusive supervision of the *Ministro de Imprentas*, who was to appoint two censors to examine each number presented, and on their approbation to grant the licence.[2] By 1788 the increasing number of journals seemed to require a stricter censorship and a law was issued regulating the details and instructing the censors in their duties. They were to take particular care that in the newspapers there should be no filthy or licentious expressions, nor satires of any

[1] Diercks, Das moderne Geistesleben Spaniens, Leipzig, 1883, p. 252. Bourgoing (Tableau, I. 313–14), about 1798 enumerates seven journals, literary, commercial and political.

[2] Novísima Recop. VIII. xvii. 4.

kind, nor political matters, nor things discrediting persons, theatres or national instruction, nor in especial things injurious to the honor or estimation of corporations or persons of any class, condition, dignity or employment. The journalists were to abstain from any covert or direct allusion against the government or its magistrates, and all this under the penalties established by the law. A special clause moreover forbade any remarks on matters resolved upon by the king, his ministers and tribunals without express permission.[1]

This would appear to limit the field of journalism so strictly as to render it absolutely innoxious, but Spanish ingenuity was not exhausted by this formidable catalogue of restrictions. In 1758 the *Diario de Madrid* had been founded and licensed especially for the publication of all that occurred of importance to commerce, literary, civil and economic. Spain was trying every expedient to revive her trade and industries, and the methods deemed appropriate for this were shown by a decree of October 23, 1790, ordering the calling in and suppression of all copies of the *Diario* of October 21, and notifying all censors and persons connected with the publication of *Diarios* and periodicals that any report of sales of bank stock or shares of other companies, or authorized securities, would be punished according to law. The subdelegates in all cities where *Diarios* were issued were ordered to serve on them a similar notification.[2]

The increased severity of censorship stimulated by events in Paris made itself felt with particular rigor on the periodical press. As the people were to be kept in ignorance of the outside world, the function of the pestilent newsmonger was to be eliminated as far as practicable from the social organization. April 12, 1791, a decree appeared which declared that many prejudicial matters saw the light in periodicals, wherefore all were suppressed except the *Diario de Madrid*, which

[1] Novísima Recop. VIII. xvii. 3.
[2] Alcubilla, Códigos antiguos, p. 1589.

for the future was to restrict itself to statements of facts and notices of things lost and found, without printing verses or political matters of any kind.[1] The extinguished journals, however, must soon have sprung to life again, for a royal order of July 23, 1793, commands the Royal Council to limit and restrict the licences and printing of *Diarios* and other periodicals, not permitting any unless they conform themselves wholly to the intentions of the king. In that stirring time, when thrills of excitement were running through all lands, it was impossible wholly to suppress the expression of what was occupying the thoughts of all men, but Carlos succeeded in accomplishing it as nearly as legislation and police could effect it. An order of December 7, 1799, commands the governor of the Council to call in the *Diario* of that day and to forbid the continuation of an article on the origin of legislation and government. The censor moreover is to be warned that such speculations are not permissible, but only articles which, without meddling with government, its origin and relations, promote commerce and industry and pure taste.[2] In one direction the development of commerce about this time raised a new question which was promptly settled by a fresh restriction. The modern plan of publishing books by subscription and issuing them in parts invaded Spain. It was an innovation threatening dangers all the more alarming because invisible, and was speedily prohibited in 1804.[3]

In spite of all this perpetual meddling, Carlos grew more and more dissatisfied with the efficiency of the censorship. In 1804 a circular to all the subdelegates in his dominions called their attention to the laws of 1554, 1558, 1627 and 1752, the strict observance of which was emphatically enjoined.[4] This did not suffice, and in 1805 he remodelled and reinvigorated the whole system by a comprehensive decree. This recited how the liberty of the press in various

[1] Novísima Recop. VIII. xvii. 5.
[2] Alcubilla, pp. 1589–90.
[3] Novísima Recop. VIII. xvi. 34.
[4] Alcubilla, p. 1580.

countries had wrought religious and political evils, while in Spain it was imperfectly repressed. The Royal Council, overwhelmed with other business, could give no attention to the censorship, while censors, receiving no salary, discharged their duties negligently, or shirked them altogether and evaded responsibility. To remedy this, the whole matter was now confided to a *Juez de Imprentas*, with absolute authority, amenable to no tribunal, and receiving his orders only from the king, to whom he was responsible for all evils arising from carelessness or connivance. He appointed his subordinates, but could not dismiss them without the royal assent. The censors were to be few, but combining the learning of all the faculties, and were to be held strictly responsible for the consequences in case they erred in too great mildness of judgment, and were not allowed to plead ignorance or lack of perception. If a censor passed a work containing anything contrary to the faith, morals, laws or prerogative, defamatory libels, personal satire, calumnies against individuals or bodies, he was dismissed and prosecuted as an abettor to the wrongful act or doctrine. Moreover, he was not to rest satisfied with the mere innocuous character of a book, but was required to consider whether it would be useful to the public, or likely to prove prejudicial through scientific errors or vices of language or style. A MS. condemned as dangerous was not to be returned to the author, but all copies and drafts of it were to be demanded and surrendered. The censorship was inviolably secret, but when an author demanded a copy of the adverse censure it was to be given to him and he was entitled to reply, when the *Juez de Imprentas* decided the case, or if in doubt gave the book to another censor. Besides all this, a preliminary censorship was confided to the episcopal vicar, to whom all MSS. were to be submitted in the first place for him to have an examination made with the utmost secrecy and to return them with his opinion. Books concerning the Colonies were moreover to be subjected to the Council of the Indies and those relating

to other departments of State to their respective ministries. A fee of sixty reals per volume was to accompany the MS. submitted to the *Juez de Imprentas;* this was not returned if the book was condemned, but a second fee of the same amount was exacted if a licence to print was issued. Any changes made on press entailed a fine of fifty ducats on both author and printer, and the altered sheets were to be cancelled and reprinted. Printing offices, book-shops and all importations were subject to rigid inspection. Even the transactions of literary academies and societies required the licence of the *Juez*, but were exempt from the payment of fees. As for periodicals, the *Juez* was not empowered to license new ones, which the king reserved to himself, but he appointed censors for the existing ones, who were to receive salaries of 200 ducats payable quarterly by the respective editors. The whole department was expected to be self-sustaining, and it was even intimated that there might be surplus funds to be employed elsewhere.[1] This elaborate preliminary censorship left the Inquisition undisturbed in its functions of guarding the public against evasions of the law. In 1809, at Lima, a priest named Camilo Henriquez was denounced to the Holy Office as a reader of prohibited philosophical works. A domiciliary visit failed to discover anything unlawful, but the informer, a Dominican intimate with the accused, persisted in his statement, and a more minute search revealed that the mattresses were stuffed with the dangerous literature. After a year in prison Henriquez was banished to Quito. In the ensuing revolution he took an active part, and his name is still honored in Chile as one

[1] Novísima Recop. VIII. xvi. 41.

When, on the enforced abdication of Carlos IV. in 1808, Ferdinand VII. succeeded to the throne, one of his first acts was to restore the censorship to the Royal Council and to take it from the *Juez de Imprentas*.—Eguizábal, Apuntes para la Historia de la Legislacion Española sobre Imprenta, Madrid, 1879, p. 140.

of the founders of the republic.[1] A more curious instance of rigor occurred when, in 1806, in consequence of the Louisiana purchase, Carlos IV. ordered the Viceroy of Mexico to investigate and report on the boundary line between Texas and Louisiana. The viceroy commissioned Fray Melchor de Talamantes to make the necessary examinations. The commissioner found that it would be desirable to consult the works of Robertson and Raynal with their maps. As these were prohibited he applied, through the viceroy, to the Inquisition for permission, saying that, although the books were detestable in consequence of their impious maxims, the information they contained, especially in their maps, was important for the public service. To this the Inquisitors replied, February 18, 1807, that these works were totally prohibited, but that they might be consulted by two *calificadores* of the Holy Office, the *frailes* José Peredo and José Pichardo, to whom instructions might be given as to the information desired, and on February 27 a commission was formally made out to these two *frailes* to consult the dangerous books in full confidence that the integrity of their faith would not suffer in thus fulfilling the wishes of the government. The commissioner himself, although a doctor of laws and a member of a religious Order, was not allowed to examine them personally.[2]

Had the object of Carlos been to stunt the intellectual development of his subjects and to discourage literature, art, and science, he could scarce have devised means more effectual than this elaborate system which concentrated power and punished any remissness or indulgence in its exercise. Yet his mop failed to keep out the ocean. The Revolution broke in and swept him and his paltry defences away. When the monarchy disappeared in the Napoleonic invasion, when the only hope of preserving Spanish nationality lay in appealing

[1] Palma, Anales de la Inquisicion de Lima, p. 86 (Lima, 1863).

[2] From the originals kindly furnished to me by General Riva Palacio.

to the people, and when that appeal was responded to by an uprising which showed that the popular heart still cherished the tradition of old-time heroism, the superannuated and worn-out institutions necessarily passed away. In 1810 the Regency felt that, as the whole machinery of absolutism had broken down, and that it had only the people to rely upon, the people must be called into council. The well nigh obsolete device of the Córtes was revived and the popular representatives were invited to assemble at Cadiz. The greater part of the kingdom was held in subjection by French bayonets; the abdicated Carlos was an exile in Italy; his son, Ferdinand VII., a prisoner in France; Wellington was at bay behind the lines of Torres Vedras in Portugal; some of the American Colonies were in full revolt and others were trembling on the verge of insurrection. Spanish self-reliance and imperturbability were never more brilliantly displayed than by the deputies who, on September 24, 1810, assembled in that remote corner of the invaded land, and through weary months framed the measures which in time transformed Spain from an absolute into a constitutional monarchy, in spite of the apparent hopelessness of their labors, in spite of the ravages of yellow fever among the crowds of refugees, and in spite of the danger which any day might bring forth of assault by land or sea.

It speaks well for the sobriety and stability of the Spanish character that, although the nation had been sedulously kept in tutelage by a parental despotism which refused it the most elementary training in self-government, there should have been so little impracticable theorism in the first really deliberative representative assembly that Castile had seen since the *Comunidades* of 1521. Weary generations were still to elapse before the nation could acquire the political aptitudes which for centuries had been so carefully eradicated, but the men of 1810, doubtless impressed with the supreme gravity of the situation, were wonderfully moderate in the discharge of their almost unlimited responsibilities. Although most of the depu-

ties were chosen indirectly by universal suffrage, nearly all of them were nobles, priests, professors or lawyers. In spite of the Chinese wall which Carlos had endeavored to build around his dominions, some ideas of human rights had smuggled themselves across the border, and the first act of the assembled Córtes was the proclamation of the sovereignty of the nation as the basis of their authority. That the shackles which had fettered the Spanish mind should be shattered by such a body was inevitable, and no time was lost in taking up for consideration a matter which was regarded as the first duty of the assembly. On September 27, only three days after the first meeting, a commission was appointed to draft a law on the freedom of the press, and on October 14, the birth-day of Ferdinand VII., it was ready to report. The discussion was warm and vigorous, but on the 19th, by the decisive vote of 70 to 32 the first article was adopted which declared that all individuals and corporations had full liberty to write, print and publish their political ideas without preliminary licence, revision, or approbation, under the restrictions embodied in the law defining offences and penalties. It would have been too much to expect that the same freedom would be granted in the religious sphere, but a great advance was made in transferring the censorship of matters concerning the faith from the Inquisition to the episcopal tribunals, and, although the Inquisitor Riesco of Llerena was himself a deputy, but a single vote was cast adverse to the change. An effort to subject press offences to trial by jury was voted down and special tribunals, in which the clergy had full representation, were created for them.[1]

[1] Modesto de Lafuente, Historia General de España, T. XXIV. pp. 447 *sqq.* —Paredes, Curso de Derecho Político, p. 642.—Toreno, Levantamiento, Guerra y Revolucion de España, Paris, 1838, T. II. pp. 201, 211, 237–45 — Eguizábal, Legislacion sobre Imprenta, p. 82.

The intrusive government of Joseph Bonaparte was too transient to exercise any influence on the course of Spanish legislation, save by breaking down the old barriers, and only passing notice need be given to its policy respecting censorship. By a royal order of September 17, 1809, the Index Expurgatorius

The sincerity of the friends of liberty was soon to be put to the test. Human nature is consistent only in inconsistency, and tolerance is the last lesson learned by those who have suffered from intolerance. It was inevitable that the unaccustomed liberty should be abused by both parties. The law had scarce been passed when a paper entitled *La triple Alianza* by Don Manuel Alzaiber excited such lively repugnance that a majority of the Córtes voted to submit it to the Inquisition. Nor was this the only test of the firmness of the convictions of the deputies. In 1812 there appeared two bitter attacks on the authority of the Córtes—the *Manifiesto* of Don Miguel de Lardizabal, a former member of the Regency, and the *España vindicada en sus clases y gerarquias* by Don José Colon, Dean of the Royal Council. Parties in the Córtes changed sides; the liberals were for the most active proceedings against the obnoxious publications and their writers, and the *serviles* were loud in defending the liberty of the press, which the partizans of reaction were busily using in attacks upon the Córtes. In the end, Don José Colon escaped censure, while Lardizabal was sentenced to banishment and his *Manifiesto* was burnt by the executioner.[1]

Still, the Constitution of Cadiz, published March 19, 1812, provided (Tit. IX. Art. 371) for the freedom of the press in political matters, subject to responsibility, in nearly the same words as the law of 1810. As in Tit. II. Art. 12, the Roman

was declared to be no longer in force. The only books not allowed free circulation were defined to be those which attacked the government or the state religion, obscene works corrupting to morality and those prescribing superstitious devotion. The determination of these was left to the discrimination of those dealing with them, with strict instructions not to exercise undue severity, and public librarians were told to use discretion in favor of artists and learned men. A free press formed no part of the Napoleonic policy; the censorship of periodicals was confided to the minister of police, with no rules to fetter his powers.—Código Español de José Napoleon Bonaparte, Cap. I. § iii. Art. 10; § v. Art. 4–7 (Colegido por Juan Miguel de los Rios, Madrid, 1845, pp. 42, 44).

[1] Lafuente, XXV., 120–8.—Toreno, III. 62–69, 106.

Catholic religion had been declared the faith of the nation, to be perpetually observed and protected by the prohibition of all others, it was not to be expected that the same liberty would be allowed in religious matters. In fact, a satirical pamphlet entitled *Diccionario crítico-burlesco*, by the librarian of the Córtes, Don Bartolomé José Gallardo, which was regarded as an attack on religion, led to his imprisonment and caused a sensation by favor of which the reactionaries of the body, under lead of the Inquisitor Riesco, made a concerted effort to resuscitate the dormant Inquisition and were narrowly defeated after a stubborn contest.[1] An elaborate law, adopted June 10, 1813, regulated the censorship in thirty-five articles,[2] but the political changes which followed were too rapid for it to become effective.

It was not to be imagined that Ferdinand VII., trained in the traditions of absolutism, would accept the principles which had stimulated the nation through its desperate struggle for existence. The manifesto or decree, dated May 4, 1814, at Valencia, but not issued till May 11, just before he reached Madrid, declared the policy of the restored monarchy. All the acts of the Córtes, the constitution and the laws enacted under it, were pronounced revolutionary and void. It is true that he promised to maintain the liberty of the press so long as it should not degenerate into licence, but his construction of this liberty was revealed in a clause in which he decreed the penalty of death against all who should, in speech or writing, defend the abolished constitution and laws or even

[1] Lafuente, XXV., 205, 211–17.—Toreno, III., 104–109.

The *Diccionario crítico-burlesco* was a burlesque on a work entitled "Diccionario razonado manual para intelligencia de ciertos escritores que por equivocacion han nacido en España." As a political squib it might have been allowed to sink into forgetfulness, but the bitter mockery which it poured over much that the nation held sacred rendered it a fair quarry for the reactionists. The inquisitorial edict of July 22, 1815, after the Restoration, forbade it even to those who held licences to read prohibited books.—Walton's Translation of Puigblanch's "Inquisition Unmasked," Vol. I. p. xxxix.

[2] Eguizábal, Legislacion Española sobre imprenta, pp. 70, 85.

keep copies of the acts of the Córtes which he ordered to be surrendered. The very memory of that body should be effaced.[1] At the same time a circular forbade, until definite press laws could be drafted, the printing of any writing of any kind until presented to the authorities, who were to submit it to learned and judicious persons free from any suspicion of entertaining seditious opinions.[2] The reaction which followed was terrible. The ferocious party spirit, which has rendered so difficult the establishment of rational liberty in Spain, availed itself of the popular enthusiasm for the restored monarch, to establish a despotism regardless of law or of mercy.[3] The law of 1805, the most comprehensive and vigorous of all the legislation on the subject, was revived by an order of November 11, 1814.[4] The return of Napoleon from Elba revived the panic fears excited twenty-five years before by the Revolution; a single order of May 2, 1815, suppressed all newspapers except the *Gaceta* and the *Diario* of Madrid, and the old laws were re-enacted for the exclusion of all literature coming from France, with instructions for their most rigid enforcement.[5] Although the decree which had annulled all the acts of the Córtes had virtually revived the Inquisition, it was formally reinstated by a royal order of June 21, 1814, and it was instructed forthwith, in conjunction with the Royal Council, to arrange for the routine of censuring and prohibiting books.[6] It was reorganized by the appointment in August of Francisco Xavier Mier y Campillo as inquisitor general, and was not backward in resuming

[1] Coleccion de Cédulas, etc., de Fernando VII., Valencia, 1814, pp. 8–10.

[2] Coleccion de Cédulas, etc., p. 11.

[3] "Su gobierno no era una monarquía absoluta, sino una dictatura civil que ahorcaba y otra militar que fusilaba."—Paredes, Curso de Derecho Político, p. 643.

[4] Eguizábal, Hist. de la Legislacion sobre Imprenta, p. 140.

[5] Eguizábal, pp. 142–144.—The "Historia de la vida y reinado de Fernando VII." (Madrid, 1842, T. II. p. 92) states that only the *Diario* escaped suppression.

[6] Coleccion de Cédulas, etc., de Fernando VII. pp. 85, 91.

its censorial functions. An edict of July 22, 1815, revived and put in force all the old regulations and Indexes; it deplored the flood of irreligious and seditious literature which had covered the land since 1808, too vast for separate and individual condemnation. A partial list, therefore, comprising only 183 prohibited books and journals, was printed, and the faithful were referred to the rules of the Index as defining what kinds of books were forbidden. All such were to be surrendered within six days, under the old penalty of 200 ducats and excommunication *latæ sententiæ*.[1]

Although Ferdinand and his courtiers could not believe it, the old régime had passed away forever, and his efforts to restore it only resulted in a series of conspiracies relentlessly repressed and culminating in the revolution of 1820, when the nerveless king, frightened at the menacing aspect of the Madrileño mob, promised to assemble the Córtes and swore on March 9 to observe the Constitution of 1812. The next day he issued a manifesto declaring his adhesion to constitutional principles and summoned his people to follow him in the path of constitutional liberty. In the revolutionary exaltation of the moment all restriction on the press vanished; a crowd of journals and pamphlets made their appearance and freedom speedily degenerated into licence. The Córtes which assembled sought to set bounds to this; by the decree of October 22 they specified the limits which should be observed, they provided episcopal censorship in matters of religion, defined offences and established their penalties and the mode of prosecution, including trial by jury. It was impossible that the antagonistic principles of absolutism, con-

[1] Walton's Translation of Puigblanch's "Inquisition Unmasked," Vol. I. pp. xxxvi.–lxvi. The list comprises thirty-five journals, and even so innocent a work as a translation of Saint-Pierre's "Paul and Virginia."

Mr. Walton adds that during the time of the Córtes there were about forty newspapers published in Spain, which in 1816 were reduced to three, all issued in Madrid—the *Gaceta* and *Diario* issued twice a week and the *Mercurio*, a monthly. All foreign papers moreover were strictly prohibited (Ibid. p. lxviii.).

stitutionalism and democracy could come to peaceable accord; agitation and disquiet prevailed, and the law of October was of little avail in restraining the abuses of the press, especially as juries were rarely found to convict. The Extraordinary Córtes of 1821 accordingly framed a new law, adopted February 24, 1822, defining offences more clearly, enhancing the penalties and modifying procedure so as to render it more effective.[1]

The second constitutional period was as brief as the first, its only permanent achievement being the final suppression of the Inquisition. Faction and passion were too strong for regulated liberty, and, in the eyes of the Holy Alliance, the inflammable condition of Spain was a menace to the peace of Europe. The Congress of Verona decided on intervention and France accepted the mandate. When a large portion of the nation welcomed the invaders, effective resistance was impossible, and in 1823 the Duc d'Angoulême occupied Spain with little difficulty. Freed from his bonds, Ferdinand VII. resumed with alacrity his rôle of absolutism. The newspapers were reduced to two—*La Gaceta* and *El Restaurador*, which breathed vengeance and stimulated popular passion against the constitutionalists. The latter was edited by a furious fraile, Manuel Martínez, and when a more moderate ministry saw fit to suppress his journal, Ferdinand rewarded him with the bishopric of Malaga. On November 14, 1824, the General Superintendent of Police issued a proclamation which was a worthy echo of the law of 1558, showing that the spirit of the sixteenth century was dominant. It was nothing less than a gigantic plan to purify at a single stroke all the existing literature of the nation. All books, pamphlets, papers or prints, issued or imported between January 1, 1820 and September 30, 1823, of whatever nature, and also everything prohibited by the Church or the Inquisition, of whatever date, were to be delivered by their owners to their

[1] Lafuente, XXVII. 135, 138, 209, 362.—Eguizábal, pp. 73–80, 93–122.

parish priests within thirty days; if the owner desired to reclaim those which should be found innocuous, he was to accompany them with duplicate lists, otherwise he was held to abandon them. The priests were ordered to send lists of all received to the police subdelegates of the districts, who were to combine them and forward to the intendant of the province. The latter was to consolidate these, to despatch them to headquarters, and to await instructions. Disobedience was threatened with summary prosecution and informers were stimulated with promise of secrecy and one-third of the fines imposed. This was followed by a royal cédula of December 22, prescribing the utmost vigilance over importations. In every custom house there were to be two inspectors, one appointed by the Royal Council, the other by the bishop of the diocese. They were to examine not only the books but the packing paper in which they were enveloped and the wrappers of packages of other merchandize. Moreover all booksellers were required every six months to submit to the Royal Council an inventory of all foreign books in stock, and the president of the Council, the regents of the Chancellerías and Audiencias, and the bishops in their dioceses were authorized, personally or through deputies, to examine and register all libraries, public and private.[1] If Spain was not relegated to the Dark Ages it was not through any lack of good will on the part of her rulers. This was followed, June 12, 1830, by an elaborate law re-establishing the ante-revolutionary system with its cumbrous machinery, for all products of the press, however insignificant. Everything contrary to the Catholic faith and royal prerogative was forbidden under pain of death, and careful provision was made to supervise the importation of books from abroad.[2] During this period the bishops even published the decrees of the Roman censor-

[1] Lafuente, XXVIII., 324, 395, 397.—Eguizábal, p. 152.

[2] Eguizábal, p. 162.

ship until even the absolutist government felt obliged to complain of this disregard of the laws of the land.[1]

Reaction thus triumphed and crushed with a bloody hand all attempts to lighten the yoke, but the time soon came when events forced legitimacy to make terms with liberalism. Don Carlos, brother of the childless Ferdinand, was heir presumptive and head of the extreme absolutists known as *Apostólicos*, who desired a theocracy and the re-establishment of the Inquisition. Their hopes were dashed when in 1829 Ferdinand married Maria Cristina of Naples, whose daughter Isabella was recognized as heir apparent. When in 1832 Ferdinand was desperately sick, Cristina was appointed regent. She changed the ministry, proclaimed an amnesty and the liberals rallied around her. On Ferdinand's death in 1833 Cristina assumed the regency. Carlist risings occurred in Biscay and extended to Navarre, Castile and Catalonia. Thus the situation forced Cristina to lean more and more on the liberals; parties defined themselves, the Carlists as absolutists and the Cristinos as constitutionalists. The logic of events thus brought about in 1837 the proclamation of a constitution based upon that of 1812, but with concessions to the royal prerogative—a compromise between the moderate and progressive liberals. A very significant alteration was the change from the recognition of Catholicism as the sole true faith and the only one to be tolerated, to a curt enunciation of the duty of the State to provide for its cult as being the religion of the Spaniards. One of the efforts of the Córtes of 1836–37 was to reconcile the liberty of the press with the repression of abuses which had grown insufferable.[2]

It was at this period that George Borrow made his well-known attempt to test the amount of freedom practically

[1] La España bajo el poder arbitrario desde 1820 á 1832. Paris, 1833, pp 182, 381.

[2] Lafuente, XXIX., 463.—Paredes, pp. 646–8.—Antequera, Historia de la Legislación española, Madrid, 1884, p. 415.—Martínez de la Rosa, Examen crítico de las Revoluciones de España, II. 238, 254, 258.

accorded to the press by printing and circulating the New Testament. The effort now would be fruitless to disentangle the facts of his narrative from the imaginative embroideries with which he was pleased to embellish them, but I presume that it is substantially true that the edition which he printed in Madrid was a version made from the Vulgate by the Padre Felipe Scio, confessor of Ferdinand VII. and therefore thoroughly Catholic in text; but the notes and commentaries, rendering it unwieldy in size, and probably unfitted for Borrow's object, were omitted.[1] We have seen that both the Holy See and the Spanish Inquisition had withdrawn the prohibition of the vernacular Scripture, provided it were accompanied with a fitting commentary, which necessarily rendered it too bulky and expensive for popular use. The abolition of the Inquisition in the revolution of 1820 had abolished the Index, and its resuscitation by the police regulations of 1824 could only have been temporary. In the absence of municipal law the general prohibition of the Church could only be effective *in foro conscientiæ*, and only be enforced by spiritual censures. That no law existed is evident from Borrow's success in having his Testament printed in Madrid and in opening a shop for its public sale; but with a change of ministry the sale was stopped and he was thrown into prison—to be released with an apology in a few weeks. His colporteurs through the country were occasionally gaoled by zealous priests; the business was contraband when public attention was called to it, and his stocks of books were seized without redress being possible. It was in the height of the Carlist war, however, and tottering ministries thought more of balancing between the favor of England and of the clergy than of the legality of their acts.[2]

[1] Borrow's Bible in Spain, chap. xix.—The more recent issues of the Bible Society for circulation in Spain are reprints of the translation of Cipriano de Valera.

[2] Borrow, chaps. xxxvi., xxxviii., xxxix., xlii., xliv., xlix.—Menendez y Pelayo (Heterodoxos, II. 660) naturally makes merry over the extravagances of

It would be useless to follow in detail the intricate maze of Spanish politics during the next forty years, with its infinite multitude of laws alternately enlarging and restricting the liberty of the press.[1] The abdication of the regency by Cristina in 1840, the proclamation of the majority of Isabella in 1843 at the age of 13, her agitated reign until driven from the land in 1868, the brief experiment of Amadeo of Savoy until his abdication in 1873, the short-lived Republic which came to an end when Alfonso XII. was proclaimed in 1874, could teach us little except that time and experience tended to moderate the extremists on both sides. The reactionary constitution of 1845 which deprived press offences of trial by jury, was succeeded by the liberal one of 1869, and this again by that of 1876, which is still in force. The nation in these experiments was undergoing the hard and practical education necessary to all peoples aspiring to self-government, for which it had been peculiarly unfitted by its tutelage under the paternalism of the old monarchy. Outside of the two groups of irreconcilables—the Carlists and the Red Republicans—the conservative of the present day no longer dreams of returning to ancient absolutism; the liberal admits the necessity of a central power armed with authority to enforce public order.[2]

As regards the liberty of the press, the constitution of 1876 following closely that of 1869, gives (Art. XIII.) to all Spaniards the right to express freely, in speech or print, their ideas and opinions without subjection to a preliminary censorship. As Art. XI. concedes liberty of thought and belief —though inhibiting public religious ceremonies not of the

Borrow, but he does not point out under what law the sale of Testaments was suppressed.

[1] The curious student will find the vast and minute legislation of Spain on this subject, between 1834 and 1867, set forth in detail by Eguizábal, op. cit. pp. 175–367.

[2] Paredes, Curso de Derecho Político, pp. 646–58.—Antequera, Historia de la Legislación española, p. 417.—Curry's Constitutional Government in Spain, New York, 1889.

Catholic religion—this covers all expression, by word or print, of every faith. But Art. XVII. permits the temporary suspension of this right when required by the safety of the State in extraordinary circumstances. Not only can this be done by act of the Córtes, but, when they are not in session, by the government, which is bound to apply for the approbation of the Córtes at the earliest moment. Still, political and military chiefs can establish no penalties save those provided by law.[1]

Practically, however, guarantees of this general character amount to little. They can be virtually annulled by the severity of press laws, and these again are modified in either direction by the temper of the courts and of the people. The *Ley de Imprenta* of 1879, formulated under the reactionary ministry of Cánovas, had a system of penality and of special tribunals which rendered the liberty of the press almost illusory. That of 1883, which is still in force, is much more liberal. It defines as a *libro* anything in print, not a periodical, and containing over 200 pages; a *folleto* is a pamphlet over 8 and under 200 pages; a *hoja suelta* is one not exceeding 8 pages; a *cartel* is a hand-bill to be posted on walls; a *periódico* is a serial publication appearing at regular or irregular intervals, not exceeding 30 days. The only requisite for the publication of a book is that it shall bear the imprint of the printer, and the same for a pamphlet, adding the deposit of three copies with the authorities at the time of publication; for *hojas sueltas* and *carteles* there must further be a signed declaration by the publisher, setting forth his name and address, and that he is in full possession of civil and political rights. Announcements and prospectuses, purely commercial and artistic, are exempted from these formalities. To establish a periodical, notice must be given to the authorities four days before the issue of the first number,

[1] Paredes, pp. 667–8.

The Concordat of 1851 with the Papacy stipulated that Catholicism should be the sole religion of Spain to the exclusion of all others (Antequera, p. 432).

with a signed declaration setting forth the name and address of the deponent and his possession of full rights, the title of the periodical, the name and address of the editor, the times of its appearance, and the office where it is printed, with evidence that the *subsidio* or tax of the latter has been paid and that it is able to perform the work. The printer is authorized to demand the delivery to him of all MSS. signed by the authors; these he cannot use against the will of the writers, but can present to the tribunals when they are demanded to shield himself from responsibility. The legal responsibility devolves on the editor, and in his default on the proprietor, without prejudice to that of others, civil or criminal, for offences committed by means of the periodical. Editors must be in full possession of civil and political rights; if these are suspended they cannot act, and the management must present another within four days, or the periodical must cease to appear. Three copies of each number, signed by the editor, must be deposited with the authorities; in Madrid three additional copies are required for the *Ministerio de Gobernacion,* of which one is sealed and returned. Reclamations and rectifications must be inserted in the same type and as prominently as the article provoking them—if from the authorities, in the next number, if from individuals within three numbers; this must be done gratuitously unless the reply is more than twice as long as the original article, in which case the extra space is to be paid for at the regular rates. The Council of Ministers can prohibit the importation of periodicals, pamphlets and *hojas sueltas* printed abroad in Spanish, and also of prints, drawings, medals, etc.[1]

This simply defines formalities and responsibilities, and leaves the punishment for infractions and offences to the penal code, which can scarcely be called harsh. Clandestine publications are especially dreaded. These are defined to be such as bear no imprint, or a fictitious one, or which have

[1] Paredes, pp. 684–9, 734–8.

not fulfilled the requisite formalities. In the code of 1870 this is punishable by *arresto mayor*, varying from a month and a day to six months, but I believe that in 1883 this was increased to *prisión mayor*, of six years and upwards. For the ordinary press offences, political and otherwise, refusing to insert reclamations and even provoking resistence to the laws, the penalty is only a moderate fine, varying from 25 to 250 *pesetas*—the peseta being equal to the French franc—but it is evident that a journal hostile to the government could be practically suppressed by depriving successive editors of their civil rights. For insulting or menacing a public official in the discharge of his duty, however, the penalty is heavier, being *prisión correccional*, from six months to six years, with a fine ranging from 125 to 1500 pesetas. The punishment provided for inciting to sedition is doubtless also applicable to journals. Moreover, for the offence of reading or distributing, in popular meetings, printed matter inciting to a change in the form of government, the penalty of banishment, from six months and a day to seven years is provided.[1] It is evident from all this that in Spain, as elsewhere, journalism is the principal object of solicitude. Literature in general may be said to be free from legal trammels. At the same time the consciences of the faithful are more closely cared for than is usual in modern Catholic communities. Of course, the decisions of the Roman Congregations are binding on the Church, and the bishops, in the exercise of their traditional power, have standing organizations for the censorship of books within their dioceses. In 1880 there appeared in Madrid an official Spanish edition of the Index of Pius IX., brought up to date with all the later decrees of condemnation.[2] The obedience to be rendered to this, however, is a matter for the conscience of the individual, for it is no longer as of old enforced with the sanctions of secular law.

[1] Novísimo Código Penal de 1870, Art. 182, 186, 203, 251, 266–7, 584.

[2] Leon Carbonero y Sol, Índice de Libros Prohibidos mandado publicar por su Santidad el Papa Pio IX. Edicion oficial española. Madrid, 1880.

When compared with the press laws of France and Germany those of Spain may be regarded as exceedingly liberal, showing how rapidly the legislative power has advanced to the recognition of the fundamental rights of human intelligence. Yet there, as elsewhere, the administration of the law is quite as important as its framing, and the discretion necessarily left to tribunals and officials can readily be so exercised as to nullify the intentions of the legislator. Popular prejudice and passion will discover means to gratify themselves, whatever be the provisions of a code. When a priest of Santander can refuse absolution to a woman because she could not prevail upon her husband to give up reading a liberal journal, a very effective extra-legal censorship can be enforced.[1] In Catalonia an introduction to reading and arithmetic was published for the use of the Protestant school, the reading portions consisting of the gospels without note or comment. A part of the edition was sent to England, and of these 1300 were returned to Spain during the summer of 1883. On their arrival at the Barcelona custom house they were seized and solemnly burnt as heretical literature.[2] So recently as 1888 the journals report a case occurring in Biscay, where an agent of the Bible Society was attacked by some twenty students under the leadership of a Jesuit father; all his Bibles and Testaments were seized and a pious bonfire was made of them; the authorities refused to send the rioters before the appropriate tribunal, with the result that the matter was remitted to a local magistrate whose correctional power was as limited as his desire to exercise it. Even more significant is a case, related in the report of the Spanish Church Aid Society for 1888, in which one of their pastors, Señor Vila, was condemned to two years and four months' imprisonment for publishing a reply to an attack on the

[1] Diercks, Das moderne Geistesleben Spaniens, Leipzig, 1883, p. 57.

[2] London Athenæum, August 18, 1883, p. 212.

Protestants by a priest.[1] Time and discussion have evidently accomplished much, but more is needed before the wisdom of the law-giver becomes the habitual rule of thought of the people, and the errors of centuries are obliterated.[2]

THE INFLUENCE OF CENSORSHIP.

Spanish literature, in the sixteenth century, like the Spanish armies, seemed destined to dominate the civilized world. In no land was there a more active intellectual movement in all the principal lines of thought, or one with a fairer prospect of brilliant development. The intensity of the Spanish

[1] Curry, Constitutional Government in Spain, p. 91. This sentence was doubtless based on Art. 240, § 3, of the Código penal, which prescribes *prisión correccional* (from six months to six years) for ridiculing the dogmas or ceremonies of any religion having disciples in Spain. The law is impartial, but it would be too much to expect as yet that its administration should be equally so.

[2] The fluctuations in the liberty of the press and its gradual development in spite of successive reactions may be traced with some accuracy in the number of periodicals. Of these there were in Madrid 18 in 1813, which in 1820 had increased to 61. These fell off to 31 in 1821, to 28 in 1822, to 13 in 1823, and to 3 in 1824. From 1825 to 1827 there were 4, in 1828, 6, in 1829, 5, in 1830–31, 6, in 1832, 10, and in 1833, 12. With the development of liberalism the number advanced to 30 in 1834, but fell off to 23 in 1835. Then it gradually increased until in 1850 there were 114 in 1860, 123, in 1870, 302. The official returns of March 1, 1882, show 63 political and 178 non-political, or 241 in all. For the whole of Spain (except Barcelona where some 20 to 30 may be reckoned) there were in 1870, 239 political journals, of which Madrid possessed 75, Cadiz 9, Seville 9, Gerona 5, Tarragona 3, Saragossa 4. The whole number of periodicals issued in Spain was 279 in 1862, about 540 in 1868, 550 in 1869, while in 1877 they were estimated as at least 800. The returns of March 1, 1882, in addition to those of Madrid stated above, showed for the provinces 188 political and 381 non-political, making for the whole of Spain 251 political and 559 non-political, or a total of 810. Possibly in this there may be omissions, for the estimate of those familiar with the subject was 900.—Diercks, Das moderne Geistesleben Spaniens, Leipzig, 1883, pp. 252–55.

In 1889 an unofficial estimate is 850.

character, its force, its disregard of obstacles, its tenacity of purpose, seemed to promise the same triumphs in the use of its admirable vehicle of expression as had been won by the conquistadores of the New World. Yet a blight settled down on Spanish literature like that which unnerved the conquering tread of the Spanish *tercios*, and by the end of the seventeenth century the nation which had seemed destined to supremacy alike in the world of letters and of arms had shrunk until in both spheres there were none so poor as to do it reverence.

To the political decadence of Spain many causes contributed and the problem is a complicated one which is beyond my present subject. It must suffice here to allude in passing to the censorship as one of those causes, by its destroying all originality of thought, by its resolutely keeping the mind of the nation as far as possible in the old medieval groove at a time when the rest of Christendom was emerging from the military to the industrial stage of civilization, and by its thus dooming Spain to a condition of practical stagnation when all elsewhere was in active movement and development. The exclusion of new ideas meant not only the stunting of literature, but the prevention of progress in the practical arts and sciences, in trade and commerce, at a time when not to advance was to retrograde. We have seen how a paternal government, by means of the censorship, was perpetually meddling with its subjects and repressing their efforts at improvement—how a book on a new method of cultivating rice could be prohibited ; how no medical work could be printed without the approbation of some ancient Sangrado, wedded to antiquated error, and how the quotations of the stock exchange became regarded as a matter too dangerous for publication. The development of the national resources was impossible under such a system. Spanish industry was overwhelmed by the competition of rivals who were constantly seeking new processes to cheapen and ameliorate products.

There was another mode in which censorship worked irre-

mediable mischief to the monarchy. Corrupt administration was a cancer which was constantly eating out its vitals and reducing it to feebleness. A free press which could expose theft and dilapidation, or even an occasional bold and timely pamphlet, might have saved it millions of annual revenue and made the difference between affluence rendering the nation prosperous and respected, and the virtual bankruptcy which was so constantly crippling its enterprises. But, as we have seen, there was nothing on which the censorship was more rigid than on all criticism of public officials. No comment was allowed upon any transactions connected with the government; no healthy public opinion was possible; officials enriched themselves and the nation was pauperized.

Yet perhaps the worst political result of censorship was the studious unfitting of the people for the changes in store for them. Through long generations they had been carefully kept in leading-strings, and when they were suddenly called upon to walk alone it is no wonder that they tottered and stumbled. The fierce revulsions and the chronic instability of Spanish institutions since the Napoleonic invasion are the direct result of the censorship in which absolutism found its most effective instrument for building its power upon the ignorance of its subjects.

All this is self-evident, and it would seem equally so that censorship was primarily responsible for the intellectual marasmus which so long afflicted Spain. Yet it has been denied that the Inquisition, which, as we have seen, was the active agency of censorship, and in the intellectual field, its prime mover, exercised any injurious influence over Spanish thought and expression. It is not only the presumptuous blindness of apologists like Don Juan Manuel Ortí y Lara, who does not hesitate to claim for the Inquisition whatever glory Spanish literature has won.[1] No one can call in question the

[1] La Inquisition, Madrid, 1877, p. 263.—"Oh, dichosas cadenas del Santo Oficio, que tan fuertemente sujetaban al mónstruo de la heregía, que no le

authority with which Señor Menendez y Pelayo speaks on all questions concerning the intellectual development of his native land, or his profound critical acquaintance with all departments of its literature, yet in an eloquent passage of his admirable "Heterodoxos Españoles" he wholly rejects the assumption that the Inquisition interfered with or stunted philosophical thought, or that Spain became a Bæotia. He points out that the Spanish Index does not contain the names of Averrhöes, Avempace, Tofáel, Pomponazio (except his *De Incantationibus*), Marsilio Ficino, Campanella, Telesio (these two with some expurgations), Descartes, Giordano Bruno, Leibnitz, Hobbes, Spinosa, or, except some trivial expurgation, of Bacon. Native philosophical works were treated with equal leniency—Lully, Vives, Sabunde, Huarte, Doña Oliva were permitted or lightly expurgated. It was the same with science: Copernicus, Galileo, Newton, are not to be found in the Indexes. In 1594 a member of the Council of the Inquisition and subsequently inquisitor general, Juan de Zuñiga, as royal commissioner reorganized the University of Salamanca, and founded there a faculty of mathematics

dejaban libertad alguna para impedir á los ingenios españoles el vuelo que tomaron desde las alturas de la fe por las regiones del saber y de la poesía!"

It is not easy to recognize the stimulus to culture by the Inquisition in placing on the Index (Quiroga, 1583.—Reusch, Die Indices, p. 419) the Commentaries of Luis Vives on St. Augustin, *nisi repurgentur*, and forcing him to a retractation (Eduard Böhmer, Francisca Hernandez, Leipzig, 1865, p. 184); or in the list of expurgations of his Commentaries on the City of God, drawn up in the Antwerp Index of 1571 (p. 2) by Árias Montano. Nor did that glory of Spanish orthodox learning, Árias Montano, himself escape the censorship which he exercised on others, as is testified by four columns of expurgations of his Commentaries on Scripture in the Index of Sotomayor, 1640 (p. 95), continued to the end in the Índice Último (p. 15)—expurgations for the most part borrowed from the Roman Index Brasichellensis (Bergomæ, 1608, p. 39), which treated him even worse.

Balmes (El Protestantismo, cap. lxxii.) is more cautious. He says nothing about the influence of the Inquisition and censorship and carefully omits to mention that the writers whom he parades most proudly as evidences of Catholic intellectuality—Reuchlin, Erasmus, Melchor Cano, Descartes, etc.—were condemned.

such as no other university in Europe possessed, ordering moreover the works of Copernicus to be used as the text-book on astronomy.[1] Vives anticipated Bacon in formulating, with an ampler grasp, the canons of induction; Gomez Pereyra anticipated Reid in his metaphysics and Descartes in the theory of the automatism of animals; Francisco Sanchez taught scepticism even more radically than Montaigne or Charron; Herrera anticipated Ramus. The anti-Aristotelian rebellion had its origin in Spain; there was a crowd of philosophers—Pedro Dolese, Francisco Vallés, Fosco Marcello, Benito Pererio, Juan Gines de Sepúlveda, Pedro Juan Nuñez, Monzó, Monllór, Cardillo de Villalpando, and others who distinguished themselves on various sides of the eternal questions which the human intellect has debated since the origin of thought. The Spanish theologians were unquestionably the most eminent in Europe. The philosophy of law is a science which Europe owes to Vitoria, Baltasar de Ayala, Domingo de Soto, rather than to Grotius and Puffendorf. General grammar and the philosophy of language is a Spanish science, founded by Francisco Sanchez in his *Minerva*. Árias Montano was the first to form a conception of compar-

[1] It was at this same Salamanca that, in the first half of the eighteenth century, Diego de Torres says that he had been there five years before he accidentally learned that there was such a thing as mathematical science.—Ticknor, Hist. of Spanish Literature, Period III. chap. ii.

Even a century earlier the factitious character which Spanish culture was assuming is exposed by Navarrete, who tells us that there were thirty-two universities and more than four thousand grammar schools where Latin was taught. This he considers a great evil. They were sought by thousands of youths seeking to escape a life of honest labor by entering the priesthood; these mostly obtained only a smattering of learning, and those who failed to enter the church became vagabonds and beggars and were the source of enormous crimes. He recommends not only the limitation of these places of so-called learning, but the enforcement of the law that no scholars should beg without holding a licence from their teachers.—Navarrete, Conservacion de Monarquias, Discurso XLVI., Madrid, 1626, p. 299.

An unflattering sketch of the students of the period may be found in Quevedo's *Historia de la Vida del Buscon.*

ative philology, which found its development in the 18th century at the hands of a Spaniard. The foundations of historical criticism were laid by Vergara—and all this the Inquisition stimulated rather than impeded.[1]

Yet these worthies, for the most part forgotten save to antiquarian research, almost without exception flourished before the censorship of Church and State had time to overcome the fervid and persistent energy of the Spaniard of Charles V. and Philip II. Granting all that may be claimed for the progress which they made, for the new fields of thought which they opened, and for the intellectual triumphs which they won, and the question only becomes sadder why so brilliant a dawn, in place of developing into a more brilliant noon, should have so speedily ended in the premature mists of twilight. The answer I think is not far to seek if we recall the series of impediments detailed above so sedulously imposed on the acquisition of knowledge and the expression of thought. It was not only that all originality became dangerous and that safety lay alone in following a designated and worn-out pathway, but even there the artificial barriers erected were

[1] Heterodoxos Españoles, II. 707–14.—Cf. Tapia, Historia de la Civilizacion Española, T. III. pp. 202–57.

How the Inquisition stimulated culture may be inferred from the case of Francisco Sanchez, the foremost man of letters of his day. Denounced to the Inquisition of Valladolid in 1584, for remarks in his lectures incredibly trivial, he was brought from Salamanca, tried, and dismissed with a sharp reprimand and a warning that if he was not more discreet he would be severely punished. In 1600 stupid and bigotted monks again denounced him. Again he was brought to Valladolid and imprisoned in a private house where he soon fell sick. His papers were all seized and submitted to *calificadores*. From his deathbed he wrote a touching petition to the inquisitors begging that he might have funeral honors, and that anything deemed improper might be expunged from his MSS. so that they could be published for the benefit of his children (Coleccion de Documentos inéditos, T. II. pp. 58, 127). Even the great Árias Montano himself did not escape denunciation, but by appealing to Philip II. and to the inquisitor general he averted formal proceedings (Ibid. T. XLI. p. 387). Healthy development of culture was impossible when such a fate impended over every scholar.

such as to check the ardor of generous spirits, and wound the proud sensitiveness of genius. How the system worked in detail can best be understood by one or two examples from a time when the censorship was yet new and before it had crushed all effort into a barren uniformity.

Estebán de Garibay was a hidalgo of Guipuscoa who had labored for years on his great historical work, the *Compendio de las Crónicas*. He was on friendly terms with the learned men of the court, he had served in the wars as a standard-bearer of his native town, Mondragon, he was of unblemished orthodoxy, a familiar of the Inquisition, and had proved his zeal against heresy upon more than one occasion. Such a man could encounter no unnecessary obstacles in bringing his book before the public, and the matter-of-fact account which he gives in his gossiping memoirs of the various details of the process enables us to realize the impediments thrown in the way of authorship by the jealous watch kept over the press, from which the most blameless was not exempt. Personal residence at the court was unavoidable, and Garibay tells us that when his MS. was ready for the press he left Mondragon October 9, 1566, and reached Madrid October 18th. His first care was to go over his book with Bartolomé de Atiença, a member of the Royal Council, Hierónimo Zurita and other scholars. Three months were consumed in this preliminary work, and on January 25, 1567, he presented it to the Royal Council, presided over by the inquisitor general, Diego de Espinosa, who appointed as its examiner the Licenciado Juan Diez de Fuen Mayor, one of those with whom Garibay had already been in council. Juan Diez referred it to the Doctor Juan Paez de Castro, chronicler of the king, who resided at Quero, near Alcalá, whither Garibay carried his MS. and remained to assist de Castro in the examination. On March 10 de Castro issued his certificate that he had found in the work no scandalous doctrine but only what was quite sound and Catholic. In all this Garibay had evidently been favored, and it is easy to see how readily a

rival or an enemy, or even a captious critic, might have prolonged his troubles or even have defeated his object, and also how ruinous these delays and journeys would be to an indigent man of letters. Armed with this certificate Garibay returned to the Royal Council, and, on April 4, the king issued from the Escorial the licence authorizing its printing in Spain. But Garibay was not satisfied with the Spanish press and had the ambition to have his cherished work printed by Plantin of Antwerp. Although Flanders was a Spanish possession this required an additional licence which was not procured until June 15. Wars and troubles long delayed his voyage to Flanders. The years which he might have profitably spent in revising his work were lost, for he could not alter a syllable in his rubricated MS. Yet his persistent patience was inexhaustible, and in 1570 he sailed with his precious copy from Bilbao to Nantes, passing thence through Paris and Cambrai to Antwerp, which he reached June 3. Seeking Árias Montano, who was printing his Polyglot with Plantin, he proceeded to make arrangements with the latter, but found that his Spanish licences were of no avail and that he must have local ones for Flanders. He returned to Brussels, where the Duke of Alva referred the matter to his privy council, and on June 16 a licence was issued to him with a privilege for ten years. Then the chancery of Brabant had to issue another, which he obtained on the 19th. Finally in August he commenced the long-delayed labors of the press; he boasts that the printing was the most rapid ever performed on a Spanish book, but it consumed a year, and he did not leave Antwerp until January 2, 1572. He counts it a great miracle and mercy of the Lord that he sent the MS. from Antwerp to Spain by sea, instead of carrying it himself through France as he had at first intended, for near Châtelhéraut he was robbed by a troop of horsemen, whom he assumes to have acted under the commands of Charles IX., because his travelling companion carried despatches from Alva to Philip II. and the courts of France and Spain were then on bad

terms. Had his MS. been lost he says he would have incurred great trouble with the Royal Council, seeing that the printed impression had to be compared with the original to verify their identity. It was moreover another special mercy that it arrived safe, for the edition was shipped in several vessels, of which one was captured by the English and two were wrecked, whereby he lost copies to the value of 2000 ducats. At length on March 29, 1572, he reached Madrid with the MS. and visited some of the members of the Council, including the president and the inquisitor general, Espinosa. The earlier portions of the work were compared with the MS. and found correct, when he was excused the rest, which he declares was a great relief to him. In consideration of the beauty of the impression and of the great expense which he had incurred, the *tassa* was fixed at four maravedís the sheet, which he seems to regard as a particular favor. His troubles however were not yet over, for the copies were to arrive and pass the inspection of the Inquisition at the ports of entry, and as they were in bales unbound there was great liability to damage in the opening and repacking. To avert this he procured from the Supreme Council of the Inquisition *cédulas* duly signed and countersigned addressed to the commissioners of the Inquisition at Valladolid, Logroño, Seville, Cadiz and Murcia, ordering the bales to be forwarded unopened to the Inquisitions of Valladolid and Seville, whereby he tells us he escaped great damage and annoyance. Finally, in June 1573, nearly seven years after the MS. had been ready for the press, he had the pleasure of presenting a bound copy to Quiroga, who had replaced Espinosa as inquisitor general, and who refused to accept it without paying the price—the first money, as Garibay informs us, that he received from his book.[1]

Of course, in this case, much of the delay and labor arose from Garibay's desire to have his work printed in Antwerp,

[1] Memorias de Garibay (Memorial Histórico Español, T. VII. pp. 284–6, 303, 318, 326, 328–9, 341).

but on the other hand there evidently was every wish to show all possible favor to a writer who was laboring loyally for the enhancement of Spanish glory. The rewards of literature are at best but scanty and doubtful, and when such routine obstacles were thrown in the path of those regarded with favor, it is easy to appreciate the discouragement weighing upon the less known, and the facilities for quenching an aspiring spirit whose labors might be thought likely to raise doubtful questions, or who might chance to excite personal enmity or jealousy among the numerous officials holding his fate in their hands. The correspondence of Francisco Sanchez, better known as *el Brocense*, the most learned humanist of his day, with Juan Vasquez del Mármol, the *corrector de libros*, shows what embarrassments and delays were inflicted on authorship, even when author and corrector were on the best of terms, at a time when a letter might be four months in reaching Salamanca from Madrid.[1] More bitter than the experience of Garibay was that of Leon de Castro, a learned professor of Salamanca. His Commentary on Isaiah (1570) was three years in seeing the light, after being ready for the press, and the delay cost him 1000 ducats. His *Apologeticus pro lectione apostolica et evangelica* (1587) consumed six years spent in journeyings to Madrid, Valladolid, and Alcalá before he could obtain authority for its publication. He attributed this to the enmity of Fray Luis de Leon and repaid it by joining in denouncing Luis as a heretic to the Inquisition, which resulted in the imprisonment of the latter for nearly five years during a trial ending in acquittal.[2]

This however was by no means all, for, after running the gauntlet of these preliminary examinations the unhappy author passed under the jurisdiction of the Inquisition, which could subsequently suppress him or mangle him at its pleasure. How it exercised this power in very wantonness may be gathered from the case of the *Historia Pontifical y Catholica*

[1] Ochoa, Epistolario Español, II. 31–5.

[2] Reusch, Luis de Leon und die Inquisition, pp. 84–5.

of the learned Doctor Gonçalo de Illescas, Abbot of San Frontes, a thoroughly orthodox and religious writer. From the licences and approbations prefixed to the work it appears that when, in 1564, he applied for permission to print, the MS. was referred by the Royal Council to the examination of the distinguished *frailes*, Alonzo de Orozco and Juan de Robles, who recommended it for publication with high encomiums on its utility. In spite of this, when it appeared, the Inquisition took umbrage at its account of some of the popes, and seized the whole impression, which, as it consisted of two quite portly folios, inflicted on him or on his printer a serious loss—the printer being Portonares, whose ruin by the seizure of the Vatable Bible I have already mentioned. He was further persecuted until he agreed to re-write the portions objected to. These additions were scrutinized by order of the Royal Council, in 1567, by Pedro Juan de Lastanosa who pronounced them free from scandal, safe, very learned and well fitted for so good a work. Nevertheless the Inquisition required that it should undergo a further revision at the hands of two professors of Salamanca, Francisco Sancho and Gaspar de Torres, together with Maestro Leon, renowned for his Commentaries on Isaiah—doubtless the Leon de Castro, whose troubles we have just considered. These declare in their certificate that they had removed from it everything liable to cause scruple in the reader, and they further bore testimony to the zeal and soundness of the author. Still a further correction was deemed necessary which was entrusted to the learned Franciscan, Francisco de Alcocer. After this careful elimination of all historical truth likely to create scandal, the second edition was printed. Again the Inquisition was dissatisfied; this edition shared the fate of the first and was put on the Index. Few men would have had the courage to persevere, after losses and discouragements so severe, but the indomitable author set to work to revise his book a third time. In 1572 the Royal Council committed it to Fray Miguel de Medina for matters concerning religion

and to the annalist Hierónimo Zurita for historical correctness. Fray Miguel certified that as now revised it could be read with safety, that it deserved to be printed not once but many times, for the benefit of the public and the well-earned reward of the author. In this third edition the book escaped condemnation, but the lynx eye of the Inquisition still found subject for expurgation, and in the later Indexes a whole chapter is ordered stricken out.[1]

Still harder was the case of the learned Franciscan, Fray Nicolás de Jesus Belando, with his *Historia civil de España desde el año 1700 asta 1733*, published in 1740. The work was dedicated to Philip V. who caused it to be carefully examined a second time by a member of the Royal Council before accepting the dedication. Yet it displeased the Inquisition and was condemned in 1744. The author ventured to protest; he offered to defend his work and to make in it the alterations which might be suggested. To this the answer was his incarceration with excessive severity, and he only left the inquisitorial prison to be sent to a convent which he was forbidden to leave, and where he was ordered to write no

[1] Illescas, Historia Pontifical y Catholica, Barcelona, 1622, T I. Prelim.—Llorente, Hist. Critique, I. 475.—Index Librorum Prohibitorum, Antverpiæ, 1570, p. 101.—Indice de Sotomayor, 1640, p. 465.—Índice Último, 1790, p. 140.

In both these later Indexes the obnoxious chapter is specified as P. I. Lib. iv. chap 35 of the editions of Madrid, 1613, and Barcelona, 1622. My copy is of the latter edition and shows that the chapter is wrongly referred to. Two leaves have been cut out bodily, containing the end of chapter 41, the whole of 42 and 43 and the beginning of 44. From references in the index and tables, one of which is *borrado*, the obnoxious passage evidently concerned the fabulous Pope Joan, whose story gave so many anxious hours to the papal historians. The entry in the index which escaped the censor—*Juan Anglico, si fue muger*—shows that Illescas only referred hypothetically to the matter, and indeed we may feel sure that after so many revisions it could not have been left in a shape offensive to pious ears.

The condition of the volume illustrates the crude methods adopted by the censors when passages too long to be readily rendered illegible had to be removed. In this case four folio pages are torn out in order to obliterate matter which probably did not occupy more than a column.

more books; he was moreover deprived of the station which he had won in his Order and was subjected to harsh penances. Nay more. Don Joseph Quiros, a priest and advocate in the Royal Council, wrote a memoir on the case, arguing that the Inquisition should hear an author before condemning his book. For this he was thrown into the prison of the Inquisition and confined in a cold damp cell during February and March, which, in view of his seventy years, would have ended his days had not Philip intervened and procured his release under condition that he would write nothing more about the Inquisition.[1] If historical criticism originated in Spain, as Señor Melendez y Pelayo assures us, we can easily see why it did not develop when such was the lot of those who hesitated to make historical facts square with the official definitions of what history ought to have been.

Thus no writer who had passed the Scylla of the Royal Council could feel sure that his work might not at any moment, during his life or after his death, fall into the Charybdis of the Inquisition. Every reader, friendly or inimical, was a possible accuser. The Edict of Denunciations, published annually in all churches, required everyone, under pain of the major excommunication, to denounce anything suspect or erroneous that he might know of anyone else having said or done or believed, and the informer was assured of inviolable secrecy. An instructive specimen of the secret accusations thus stimulated is a paper presented about 1630 to the Supreme Council of the Inquisition by Don Luis Pacheco de Narváez, teacher of Philip IV. in philosophy and fencing. In this, after alluding to the duty imposed on him by the annual Edict, he proceeds to point out many errors and insults to the church contained in the books of Francisco de Quevedo y Villegas —the *Política de Dios*, *La vida del Buscon*, *Sueños* and *Discurso de todos los Diablos*. These books had all passed the censorship of the Archbishop of Saragossa, and been pro-

[1] Llorente, Hist. Critique, II. 428, 465.—Índice Último, p. 145.

nounced to contain nothing contrary to the faith, and at least the *Política de Dios* had been licensed in Madrid. Now in the latter three works there are many things that could reasonably be objected to by a reverent son of the Church, but most of the points made by the worthy fencing-master show how the minute and captious criticism of the Inquisition had trained the malevolent to find error in the simplest things. When, for instance, Quevedo in the *Política* warns his king to vigilance and adduces in support that it is only once related of Christ that he slept (Matt. VIII. 24) and then the disciples immediately cried out "Lord save us: we perish," Narváez characterizes the passage as so horrible that he refers to it with dread, for it implies a denial of Christ's humanity.[1] So in the *Buscon* a description of a half-starved horse, of which it is said that one could see the penances and fasts it had endured, is gravely denounced as a reflection on these medicines of the soul and means of grace.[2] This sounds like a travesty of inquisitorial censorship, but the seriousness with which it is pre ented to the dread tribunal shows the training which the people had received, and it is not so far removed from the eccentricities of official expurgation as to be without interest as an illustration of the ease with which censors and *calificadores* could find guilt in the most innocent expressions.

Narváez's denunciation was fruitless. Quevedo had not yet fallen under the displeasure of Olivares and his works remained uncondemned.[3] Comparing the audacious and often

[1] Política de Dios, cap. ix. (Ed. Pamplona, 1631). In the revised edition the passage in fact is completely rewritten (Ed. Madrid, 1729, pp. 43–44).

[2] Menendez y Pelayo, III. 879–80.

In a similar spirit, when Las Casas, Bishop of Chiapa, sought to defend the Indians from the oppression of the Conquistadores, even such a man as Juan Gines de Sepúlveda did not hesitate to accuse him of heresies respecting the papal power and the righteousness of conquering the infidel.—Coleccion de Documentos inéditos, T. LXXI. pp. 339 *sqq*.

[3] In the Index of Sotomayor (1640, p. 425) the *Política de Dios* is permitted in the Madrid edition of 1626 and no other—possibly because there may have been some difference in the readings, but probably as a protection

brutal satire in which he revelled on the follies and vices of all classes, with the hypersensitiveness of censorship of which we have seen examples, one is impressed with the capriciousness of the Inquisition and can estimate how little men could forecast what it might condemn or tolerate. The latitude which this allowed to personal favoritism or enmity and the benumbing influence of such uncertainty could only have a most dispiriting and unfortunate influence on all classes of literature. This capriciousness is well exemplified in the case of the *Celestina*. One of the objects professed by the censorship, as we have seen, was the preservation of popular morals from all contamination. About 1571 the Inquisition of Saragossa inquired of the Supreme Council whether it ought to issue an edict against pictures containing nudities, and the reply was that this could be done when the nudities were too shocking. Llorente tells us, indeed, that great annoyances were inflicted on those who had snuff-boxes or fans or objects of art and decoration on which were represented mythological subjects in a manner regarded by the Inquisition as too free.[1] The *Celestina* is one of the great monuments of Spanish prose. It first appeared in 1499 and more than thirty editions were printed in the sixteenth century; it was translated into all European languages and exercised greater influence on Spanish literature than perhaps any other book.[2] It was even used as a text-book in the schools, to the great scandal of Azpilcueta, who urged that the major part of it

against the pirated editions of Aragon and Navarre. Ten others of his books, which are works of edification, are also permitted. All the rest of his writings, whether in print or in MS., are prohibited at the special request of the author ("lo qual he pedido por su particular petition, no reconociendolos por proprios"), probably the only request of the kind on record. He became, however, too much a classic to remain on the Index, and in the Índice Último of 1790 (p. 221) the only one of his books which appears is his posthumous *Parnaso Español*, which is ordered to be expurgated.

[1] Llorente, Hist. Critique, I. 489.

[2] Ticknor's Spanish Literature, I. 235–44 (Ed. 1864).

should be stricken out.[1] Yet the Inquisition saw nothing objectionable in its crude indecency until the Index of 1640 ordered about fifty lines to be expurgated; this was continued in the subsequent Indexes and it was only prohibited in 1793.[2]

How readily this arbitrary power was abused by enmity or favoritism is visible in the case of the Venerable Servant of God, Juan de Palafox y Mendoza, Bishop of Puebla, who refused the archbishopric and for a time served as Viceroy of Mexico. In his quarrel with the Mexican Jesuits, the Inquisition of Mexico took the side of his antagonists and suppressed his legal papers drawn up in defence of the rights of his church. After his return to Spain and appointment to the bishopric of Osma, the Supreme Council of the Inquisition suppressed his letters on the Jesuits and had them publicly burnt by the executioner in 1659, while the Jesuits were freely permitted to fill the court and indeed all Spain with satires and libels on him. His letters and memorials were duly placed on the Index, but when the prolonged effort for his canonization so nearly succeeded, and in 1760 the Congregation of Rites reported that after careful examination of all his works, in print and MS., it had found nothing objectionable in faith and morals, and when this report was confirmed by Clement XIII. the Inquisition removed the prohibition. As the facile instrument of royal authority it even, in 1762, prohibited a work by a German Jesuit, Franz Neumayr, because, among other reasons, it was derogatory to the memory and writings of Palafox.[3]

1 Azpilcueta, Enchiridion sive Manuale Confessariorum, cap. xxiii. No. 30.

2 Índice de Sotomayor, p. 948.—Indice de Vidal Marin, 1707, II. 280.—Índice Último, p. 40.—Menendez y Pelayo, II. 708.

In the catalogue of the publisher, Pedro Joseph Alonso y Padilla, in 1737, the Celestina appears with the note "se ha de expurgar de qualquier impression que sea, para poderle leer, como consta del Expurgatorio del año de 1707."

3 Palafox y Mendoza, Obras, Ed. 1762, T. I. Prolegom.—Cargos y Satisfacciones, No. 47 (Obras, XI. 241).—Satisfaccion al Memorial (XI. 289, 328,

If in Spain the Inquisition was thus forced to yield to the pressure of Carlos III. who earnestly desired the canonization of the saintly bishop, in Mexico it preserved its malignant rancor. Palafox had persistently refused to have his portrait taken, but an artist found no difficulty in sketching him while in performance of a public function. The likeness was engraved and immense numbers were circulated, as he was universally beloved by his flock. After his return to Spain in 1649, a friend of the Jesuits, travelling on a feast-day, stopped at a way-side inn kept by an Indian, who had in honor of the day erected a little altar with a lighted candle and surrounded it with images of saints. Among these was a portrait of Palafox; it bore no nimbus or sign of sanctity, but the traveller on reaching Mexico reported the circumstance to the Inquisition, which at once issued an edict ordering the surrender of all likenesses of Palafox, under pretext of preventing the idolatry of worshipping a living man. Immense quantities of them were thus collected—in Puebla alone over six thousand, and in many places more than the number of inhabitants. When the news of this reached Spain it caused a great sensation as it was used by the Jesuits to prove that the prohibition of the portrait meant condemnation of the man.[1] In Mexico the edict of suppression remained in force until after Spain had for a century been endeavoring to obtain his canonization. I have a copy of a portrait of him, *borrado*, with the features obliterated by smearing with printers' ink, which happens in the inscription to refer to an event with the date of 1787, showing that it was issued subsequent to that time, and that the Mexican Inquisition was still implacable. It also shows how long the memory of the saintly man lingered among the descendants of his flock.[2]

466–7).—Rosende, Vida de Palafox (Obras, XIII. 314).—Índice Último, p. 203.

[1] Rosende, Vida de Palafox, Lib. III. c. ii. (Obras, XIII. 309).

[2] I owe this portrait to the kindness of General Riva Palacio of Mexico. Somewhat similar was the condemnation by Valdés in the Index of 1559

This was not by any means the first time that the Jesuits had sought to utilize the censorial powers of the Inquisition to maintain themselves against their opponents. When in 1627 the Universities of Salamanca, Valladolid and Alcalá united in a memorial against the establishment of the Jesuit College in Madrid, the Society answered it by an application to the Inquisition to suppress the memorial and prosecute the author, Doctor Juan de Balvoa, professor of law in Salamanca, but the *calificadores* of the Supreme Council decided that there was no theological error in it.[1] When the eccentricities of Padre Juan Bautista Poza gave the Dominicans a fair opportunity to attack their detested rivals, the Inquisition, in spite of its Dominican tendencies, was forced by Olivares to come to the rescue of the Jesuits. The pamphlets against against them were rigorously suppressed and the writers arrested and prosecuted. The ex-Carmelite, Doctor Juan de Espino, was the chief sufferer. For some fifteen years he carried on an indomitable fight and was fifteen times thrown into inquisitorial or episcopal prisons.[2] Francisco Roales was another opponent, whose writings suffered, though by keeping in Italy he seems to have escaped bodily harm. In 1634 some pamphlets of his and of other opponents to the Society were burned by the Inquisition in Madrid with extraordinary solemnity, such, indeed, as had never been vouchsafed to the writings of the greatest heretics. A procession

(Reusch, Die Indices, p. 232, preserved in the Índice Último, p. 262) of a forgotten controversial tract against the Jews, printed in 1481 by Hernando de Talavera, then confessor of Queen Isabella and subsequently the first Archbishop of Granada. All his contemporaries unite in praise of his rare Christian virtues, but he was practically hounded to the death on a charge of Judaism by Lucero, the inquisitor of Córdova, who was punished for his misdeeds and who was thus spitefully avenged by the condemnation of Talavera's book, after an interval of half a century.

[1] Biblioteca Nacional de Madrid, Seccion de MSS. S. 294 fol. 220.—Llorente, Histoire Critique, II. 424.

[2] Cartas de Jesuitas (Memorial Histórico Español, T. XIII. pp. 9, 11, 13–17, 19, 24, 27, 32, 181, 230; T. XIV. pp. 395–6; T. XV. pp. 100–2; T. XVII. pp. 197, 218, 285, 395; T. XVIII. p. 308).—Índice Último, p. 94.

marched through the streets escorting a mule with carmine velvet trappings, bearing a box painted with flames in which were the condemned pamphlets, while a herald proclaimed with sound of trump that the Society was relieved of all accusations and that these papers were false, calumnious, impious and scandalous. The moral effect of this display was however somewhat impaired by the rabble supposing that the box contained the bones of a Jew and shouting "Death to the dogs!" "Burn the Jews!" and other pious cries. The edict of condemnation was sent to all the churches of the land to be duly published.[1]

When Jesuit influence declined, the censorial power of the Inquisition was used effectually by the *frailes*, whose pedantic and artificial style of preaching was ridiculed so mercilessly by Padre Francisco de Isla in his *Fray Gerundio*, published under the pseudonym of Lobon de Salazar. As the successive volumes appeared they were placed on the Index by edicts of 1760 and 1776, together with all the controversial writings to which they gave rise, and all further discussion of the subject was prohibited.[2] Nothing could have been more wholesome for the purification and elevation of pulpit eloquence than such a discussion, but as usual the censorship was antag-

[1] Cartas de Jesuitas (Mem. Hist. Español, T. XIII. pp. 67-71, 73-4).—Índice Último, p. 94.

Accompanying the edict of condemnation was another, deploring in general terms the scandals caused by the bitter hostility between the different religious Orders. To prevent this for the future, any insult offered to any Order by a member of another, whether in the pulpit, the lecture room, or the press, was declared punishable by the major excommunication, imprisonment in a distant convent, and dismissal from any office held in the Inquisition, with disability for reinstatement. The superiors of all the Orders were commanded to exercise the strictest censorship over the writings of their members and to strike out all offensive expressions before approving of any book. Mutual rancor, however, was too deep-seated to be thus repressed and the edict had to be repeated in 1643 (MSS. of Bodleian Library, Arch S. 130.—Cartas de Jesuitas. Mem. Hist. Esp. T. XVII. p. 285).

[2] Índice Último, p. 162.

onistic to all improvement, and the intellectual stagnation of Spain was too precious an inheritance to be disturbed.

The expenses attendant on the cumbrous and elaborate formalities of the censorship were another heavy burden and discouragement to struggling literature. I have already alluded incidentally to the exactions levied at each stage of the process and to the fines for their non-observance, which were expected to defray the cost of the whole organization. The victim furnished the wood for the pile on which he was burnt. It would have been an exception to the ordinary administration in those days if the authorized charges did not form a comparatively small portion of the total sum levied on authors. They were wholly defenceless; they could only suffer in silence and not venture to provoke, by ill-timed complaints, the malice of those who controlled their fate. We have seen the unchecked abuses of the censorship in the *visitas de navios*, and there can be no reasonable doubt that similar ones infected the cumbrous routine of the Council, for which there was such abundant opportunity. The arbitrary power exercised by the officials is seen in a simple order of the *Juez de Imprentas*, in 1713, instructing the messenger who delivered the licences to demand, of all books that were printed, copies for the Escorial, for the president and each member of the Royal Council, for the secretaries of Gobierno and Camara, for the superintendent and for the messenger himself. Of these numerous copies three were to be bound, and anyone refusing to give them was to be prosecuted. This spoilation of the feeble literary folk proved so oppressive that Philip V., in 1717, says that many authors refused to write and others kept their MSS. unprinted, wherefore he reduced the number to three copies—one for the Royal Library, one for the Escorial, and one for the governor of the Royal Council. Numerous regulations issued between 1761 and 1796 show that it was difficult to enforce the rule even for the Royal Library, and that there was a constant effort to

increase the number. In the reinvigorated law of 1805 six copies were required.[1] Even heavier, comparatively, was the burden imposed on importations. No bookseller obtaining new books from abroad could be sure that they would be admitted, and of the small quantity that he could venture to import as an experiment, he was required, by a regulation of 1784, when applying for a licence, to give two copies, one to the Royal Council and one to the examining censor, besides paying the latter one real per sheet for reading it.[2]

In fact, with the exception of the casual action of Philip V. in 1717 and the temporary relaxation under Carlos III., it may be said that as a rule it was the desire of the Spanish government to discourage authorship systematically. This spirit finds expression in the preamble of the law of 1627 by Philip IV., called *el Grande* by his flatterers. In this he distinctly asserts as a reason for the stricter enforcement of the censorship that there is an excessive abundance of books, wherefore special attention and care are to be directed to decreasing their number by refusing licence to such as are unnecessary and can be dispensed with, and of which the reading will not be of benefit to the public.[3] This stimulated

[1] Alcubilla, Códigos antiguos Españoles, pp. 1585–6.—Novísima Recopilacion, VIII. xvi. 37, 38, 39, 40, 41.—Philip had himself set the example of exactions in 1716 by ordering that a bound copy of every book printed since 1711 and of all thereafter published should be delivered to the Royal Library as well as to the Council.—Novís. Recop. VIII. xvi. 36.

This was not the first time that these exactions were levied on literature. In 1636 among the burdens enumerated was the necessity of giving a copy of every book to each member of the Royal Council.—Picatoste, Grandeza y Decadenza de España, III. 170.

[2] Alcubilla, pp. 1582–1586.

[3] Novísima Recop. VIII. xvi. 9.—Yet Philip IV. had, but two years before, richly endowed the Jesuit Imperial College of Madrid with funds for buildings and for the maintenance of twenty-three professorships, embracing all departments of human knowledge (Coleccion de Documentos inéditos, T. III. p. 548). Learning and culture were thus ostentatiously encouraged provided they were kept within certain rigorously defined channels, but the expression of their development was studiously repressed. The natural result of the mutually destructive principles embodied in this system is seen in the assertion

the severity of the censors, whose individual tastes and opinions were thus made the standard by which to suppress unheard unfortunate authors struggling to reach the public. Scholarship and culture were doomed when authors were openly warned that, in addition to the obstacles inherent in the system, the product of lifelong labor might be smothered and extinguished because some pedant or ignoramus might pronounce it unprofitable or unnecessary. This provision of the law was not allowed to become obsolete. In 1797 it was cited in refusing a licence for a new edition of a history of the royal life-guard. The work was admitted to contain nothing contrary to faith, morals, or the royal prerogative, but was condemned as simply useless.[1] In 1804, moreover, the enforcement of this standard of utility was strictly enjoined on all subdelegates of the censorship.[2] The deadening influence of such a system on literary aspirations can scarce be exaggerated.

The result of this long-continued and systematic repression of intellectual activity is forcibly presented to us by Padre Feyjoo in his Discourse on the Glories of Spain. His mere effort to recapitulate the claims to respect of Spanish intellect shows how low it had fallen by the second quarter of the eighteenth century. He admits that in Europe Spain was regarded as a land scarce removed from barbarism—scarce distinguishable from Africa save by language and religion—and he argues that this is the result of indolence and not of the lack of natural aptitude. In his effort to prove this it is pitiable to mark the eagerness with which the good padre gathers up every fragment of reputation, and the pious care with which he treasures every approving word bestowed by a

of Manuel Lanz de Casafonda, a century and a quarter later, that in that magnificent foundation the only subjects taught were Latin, moral theology and mathematics—the latter not extending beyond the principles of arithmetic and geometry (Valladares, Semanario erúdito, T. XXVIII. pp. 158, 164).

[1] Alcubilla, p. 1577. [2] Alcubilla, p. 1580.

foreigner on Spanish writers. Nothing escapes his diligence. Lucan and Seneca, Quintilian and Columella, are cited in support of Spanish intellect, and the list of great men is carefully brought down to modern times, but it is observable that these illustrious names virtually cease with the first quarter of the seventeenth century. The virile strength of the Spanish character carried on the development of culture for a while after the establishment of the censorship, but the unrelaxing pressure wrought its work, and then numbness and torpor checked the fruiting of the harvest which had given such brilliant promise. The lighter literature serving to amuse a public trained to avoid serious thought, lingered awhile longer, but this in turn flickered out. The triumph of Church and State was complete over a docile people, to whom were closed the avenues of intelligence which were bringing new life and light to all other Christian nations. The deadly blight of enforced orthodox uniformity settled down upon the land and Spanish genius sought safety in a slumber which lasted for two centuries. Of course Feyjoo does not recognize or does not dare to state the reason, while deploring the result which he labored so strenuously to overcome. He explains the lack of varied culture among his contemporaries by the lack of books and teachers, but he does not ask himself why books and teachers were lacking.[1] The learned Gregório Mayans y Siscar was more logical when, in writing to Macanáz in 1748, and asking him to inquire whether in Holland printers could be found to bring out at their own expense some works on jurisprudence, he adds that it is impossible to print such books in Spain because, as there is no knowledge, the taste for them is also lacking.[2] This epitomises the story —Catholic Spain looking to heretic and rebellious Holland for an intellectual market which had been persistently de-

[1] Feyjoo, Theatro Crítico, T. IV. Discursos XIII. XIV.

[2] Ochoa, Epistolario Español, T. II. p 171.

stroyed at home.[1] The transitory efforts of Carlos III. to liberalize the system were unavailing. An educated public is a plant of slow growth, and even under Carlos III. the system was still strong enough to crush the aspirations of scholarship. In 1779 two learned brothers, *frailes* of the Order of Merced, Pedro and Rafael Mohedano, commenced the publication of a *Historia literaria de España*, of which nine volumes in quarto had appeared in 1786, when the Inquisition took umbrage at it and stopped the publication.[2]

Of course it was not the absence of natural aptitude in the people that deprived Spain of her share in the wonderful progress made by civilization after the censorship was effectively organized—centuries in which she was, not a leader of thought, but the unwilling recipient of such advances made elsewhere as could filter through her closely barred frontiers. It would be grossly unfair to the Spanish race to assume that this arose from any inherent deficiency. The Spaniard is patient of labor, acute of thought, gifted with imagination and eloquence and possessing a language admirably adapted for the expression both of reason and emotion. The stunted intellectual development of the nation during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries must be explained by factitious and not by natural causes—by the systematic and uncompromising repression of all intellectual effort beyond the narrow limits prescribed by a petrified theology

[1] Gregório Mayans, under the pseudonym of Justo Vindicio, gives a most deplorable picture of the condition of Spanish learning and literature in the middle of the eighteenth century—*paucissimi sunt*, he says, *qui colunt literas*, *cæteri barbariem*. Learned men, he adds, are obliged to sell their books in order to live, and to burn their MSS. to prevent their use by grocers as wrapping paper. For all this Manuel Lanz de Casafonda, in his defence of Spanish literature, takes him sharply to account (Valladares, Semanario erúdito, T. XXVIII. pp. 152-3). Casafonda however says (Ib. p. 125) that the time spent in the schools and universities is lost, and that those who desire to learn are obliged, after leaving them, to employ competent instructors.

[2] Bourgoing, Tableau de l'Espagne Moderne, I. 316.

and an absolute government, and, even within these limits, by the arbitrary capriciousness which rendered dangerous all exercise of thought. If of this any further proof were needed it would be found in the revival of Spanish letters when the shackles were gradually removed—when the manly struggle of mind with mind once more became possible, when men began once more to find themselves permitted to think and speculate on the mysteries of human life and to communicate to their fellow men the thoughts that filled their souls. The admirable rena cence of Spanish literature within the last two generations shows us how much the world has lost by its repression during the preceding two centuries, and is full of promise that its future will amply fulfil the expectations justified by its early achievements.

MYSTICS AND ILLUMINATI.

DEVELOPMENT OF MYSTICISM.

From the remotest antiquity there has been handed down the belief that the soul could elevate itself to the Godhead through prolonged contemplation, assisted by mortification of the flesh. When the body is systematically weakened by fastings and vigils, spiritual exaltation is readily superinduced in certain natures by continued mental concentration; the faculties become resolved into vague consciousness, passing through the stage of ecstasy to that of trance. Released from its bonds of flesh the soul apprehends, with all the distinctness of reality, that which has formed the object of its waking aspirations, and it enjoys visions of ineffable bliss in reunion with its Creator. Such was the spiritual intoxication of the Brahmanic and Buddhist *tapas* and *samadhi*, and such was the Yoga system through which union with the Universal Soul was purchased by the austerest mortifications of the flesh. It was inevitable that Christian devotees should become adepts in the practice and it was accepted by the Church as a recognized form of religious exercise. Mystical theologians, such as Richard of Saint Victor, St. Bonaventura, John Gerson and many others, prescribed the methods through which the soul by means of contemplation or mental prayer could lift itself above itself, could reach the Divine Essence and become divinely illuminated. This led to ecstasies with visions of heavenly beings and prophetic revelations, such as those vouchsafed to St. Hildegarda and St. Birgitta. The seraphic Franciscan Order contained many mystics, especially in its Spiritual section, and St. Douceline may be regarded

as the prototype of St. Teresa de Ávila, while Jacopone da Todi, the author of the Stabat Mater, sang the raptures of ecstatic abstraction in which the intellect disappears and humanity is annihilated in the flood of divinity. So the German mystics of the fourteenth century—Master Eckart, John Tauler, John of Rysbroek, Henry Suso and others, taught, in various degrees, the virtues of mental prayer and profound abstraction, in which the soul gradually lost the consciousness of earthly things and was elevated to heaven, where in a rapture of divine love it became one with God and tasted in advance the joys of paradise.[1] This high-wrought exaltation of the nervous system was necessarily at times succeeded by reaction, in which the devotee fancied himself abandoned by God and doomed to perdition, but through these alternate vicissitudes he advanced, gradually overcoming the weaknesses of the flesh and liberating the spirit, until he reached the stage of perfection in which his will was wholly subordinated to that of God, and he practically became an incarnation of the divine spirit. In this state he was necessarily sinless.

It was not alone the orthodox who ventured into these perilous paths of superhuman ecstasy. The Amaurians and their followers, the Brethren of the Free Spirit, commonly designated in Germany as Beghards and Beguines, indulged in the same practices and drew from them dangerous inferences, perhaps inevitable in their pantheistic tenets. They invented or adopted the term Illuminism to describe the condition of man illuminated interiorly with the Divine Spirit, so that his acts became those of the Spirit itself, and he was no longer subject to external laws. Moreover, as the perfected adept thus could do no sin it followed that whatever he might do was righteous. When the flesh was thoroughly subdued to the spirit this belief was probably harmless, but

[1] "Secundum secessum illum, quo homo a seipse deficiens, in unum illud quod Deus est se recepit ac aberravit, atque cum illo unum effectus est, ubi jam homo non ut homo operatur."—H. Susonis de Veritate Dial. cap. ix. (Opp. Laur. Surio interprete, Colon. Agripp. 1588, p. 288).

when the original Adam reasserted himself, it could only lead to the overthrow of the moral law. Although the results of this have probably been exaggerated by eager heresiologists, there were enough extravagances perpetrated by zealots who taught the pre-eminent purity of nudity, and enough hypocrites who gratified the senses under the veil of asceticism, to give color to the denunciation of Illuminism as destructive to morality. The condemnation of these beliefs at the Council of Vienne in 1312, and the embodiment of its decrees in the canon law, rendered the subject a familiar one to all canonists, although the heretics who provoked the denunciation were obscure and the heresy would otherwise have been in time forgotten. It afforded, however, as we shall see, a weapon for the destruction of orthodox mysticism when that grew distasteful to the Church. Mystic orthodoxy and heresy were so closely related that it was easy to confuse them. After the Lutheran revolt the spiritual exaltation of mysticism became regarded as dangerous, for it led to the conclusion that man could work out his own salvation and bring himself into direct relations with God without the intermediation of the priest. Yet it had the authority of too many of the loftiest names in ecclesiastical annals to be directly condemned, and the readiest means of attack lay in the Illuminism which threatened to release its followers from the obedience due to the Church, and in the doctrine of impeccability with its tendency to fleshly indulgences. We shall trace hereafter some of the steps in the process which converted the orthodoxy of Bonaventura and Gerson into the heresy of Molinos and Madame Guyon.

Spain, during the middle ages, was singularly free from mystic aberrations. Eymerich, in his *Directorium Inquisitorum*, written in 1375, enumerates all the heresies with which he and his predecessors had to struggle, and he makes no mention of errors of the kind. The first inquisitorial manual compiled after the establishment of the New Inquisition

in 1480, is the *Repertorium Inquisitorum*, printed at Valencia in 1494, and it is likewise silent on the subject.[1] In fact there was scarce enough spiritual activity in Spain during the medieval period to lead to the cultivation of mysticism, whether orthodox or heretical.

Yet in the intensity of the Spanish character there was ample material for religious enthusiasm when once the nation should be aroused from the careless tolerance bred of habitual intercourse with the Moors. The process was slow but it moved with accelerating momentum and culminated in the establishment of the Inquisition in 1480, the conquest of Granada and the expulsion of the Jews in 1492, and the alternative offered to the Moors in 1502 of conversion or expatriation. Religious fervor was enkindled, the exaltation of the faith was taught to be the duty of every Spaniard and of the State, and a fierce fanaticism, stimulated by the all-pervading functions of the Holy Office, interpenetrated the national character with a completeness of which probably the only counterpart is to be found in the early career of Islam. The Reformation added fuel to the flame by the abhorrent antagonism which it excited in the masses of the people. The Spanish temperament was distinguished rather by force than by moderation; religion, thus made the chief business of life, could scarce fail, on the one hand, to develop into superstition, or on the other to rise into the burning devotion of a Loyola, and both phases combined to furnish a peculiarly fruitful soil for mystic extravagance. The works of the leading mystics became a prominent portion of the national literature to be read as classics by everyone, thus insensibly introducing their teachings into the very fibre of the national

[1] Repertorium Inquisitorum s. vv. *Beatæ, Begardæ, Beguinæ, Hæresis, Hæretici*, etc.—Menendez y Pelayo (Heterodoxos Españoles, II. 523) ascribes errors of the kind to numerous Spanish heretics of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, but he has been misled by the confusion so long existing between the Spiritual Franciscans and Fraticelli of the south and the so-called Beghards and Beguines of Germany.

character.[1] It was inevitable that there should be throngs of ardent devotees eager to win the sublime delights of ecstasy. It was equally inevitable that there should be no lack of impostors to practise on popular credulity, and that both classes should find admirers and disciples without number in a population left almost wholly without due religious instruction by the negligence of its worldly prelates.[2] It was the business of the Inquisition to restrain the one class from aberrations from the faith, and to detect and punish the other. The duty was not an easy one, for the boundaries between heresy and sainthood were often perilously obscure, and self-deception played so large a part in many of the manifestations of the mystics that the differentiation of conscious from unconscious imposture is often impossible for the impartial investigator.

The *beata*, or devotee, occupied in religious practices without formally entering a religious order—perhaps at most a Tertiary of the Mendicants—was a character well known among all Spanish communities as fervor grew strong towards the close of the fifteenth century, and popular veneration frequently ascribed to these women supernatural attributes. It is related of Cardinal Ximenes, while he was yet provincial of the Franciscans, about 1493, that when making a visitation of his province he came to Gibraltar and, at the sight of the African coast, was seized with a longing to earn martyrdom in a mission to convert the Moors, but was deterred by a beata who with prophetic vision announced to him the splen-

[1] About 1761, Don Manuel Lanz de Casafonda, in laying out a course of reading for a stranger learning Castilian, commences with the *Guia de Pecadores* of Luis de Granada, followed by the *Nombres de Cristo* of Luis de Leon, the *Cartas* of Santa Teresa and the works of Juan de Ávila. After these the student may undertake Cervantes.—Valladares, Semanario erúdito, T. XXVIII. p. 122.

[2] For the condition of the Spanish Church in the sixteenth century see Alfonso de Castro, *Adversus Hæreses*, Lib. I. c. xiii. and Carranza, *Comentarios sobre el Catechismo*, p. 167*b*.—Comp. Menendez y Pelayo, *Heterodoxos Españoles*, II. 525.

did career which lay before him and the services which he would render to Church and State.[1]

That a man of the clear, shrewd intellect of Ximenes should allow himself to be governed in so important a matter by the predictions of an inspired crone seemed perfectly natural to his contemporaries. It was universally believed that the most intimate intercourse could take place with the invisible world. If the sorcerer could evoke Satan and hold converse with him, the holy man or woman cou'd have visions of Christ and the Virgin and receive revelations of the future. St. Birgitta and the blessed Angela of Foligno are familiar examples of the habitual communication with heavenly beings to which man could attain by austerities and devout contemplation. When this was the universal belief authorized by the Church, there was no limit to the superstition of the vulgar, to whom the direct personal intervention of God was a possibility of daily occurrence. Even in the latter half of the sixteenth century an incident related by Zapata shows how implicit was the credulity on which devotee or impostor could rely. A company of sharpers travelled through Spain, personating Christ and the apostles, lodging at wayside inns where they would be received with washing of feet and other demonstrations of veneration. At table, after meat, they would summon the host to confess his sins, which naturally would mostly be short measure and other similar peccadillos. Then he would be told to produce his money, of which he was allowed to retain a small portion as honestly earned; another share, as slightly tainted, St. Peter would take to pay the expenses of the party, while the bulk of it, as wrongfully acquired, was assigned to the devil. Then Satan, with hoofs and horns, would sweep in and carry it off. This blasphemous swindle was successfully practised for some time, until probably some agnostic Boniface denounced to the authori-

[1] Gomez de Rebus Gestis a Francisco Ximenio, Compluti, 1569, Lib. I. fol. 7.

ties the divine company, who were soundly scourged and sent to the galleys.[1]

When such was the condition of popular enlightenment we can understand the career of the Beata of Piedrahita, although the attention and the discussion which she excited in 1509 show that her performances were a novelty, and that she was probably the first of a long series whose extravagances we shall have to consider. The practices of the mystics were by this time tolerably well known. Francisco de Villalobos, physician to King Ferdinand, writing in 1498, complains of the *Aluminados* or Illuminati, who were derived from Italy, but of whom there was *mucha pestilencia* in Spain and who should be cured by scourging, cold, hunger, and gaol.[2] Francisco de Osuna, the earliest Spanish mystic writer, in 1527 alludes to a holy man of his acquaintance who for more than fifty years had devoted himself to *recojimiento*—the divine abstraction of mental prayer which was the means employed to elevate the soul until it enjoyed direct communion with God.[3] To what these aspirations might lead in untutored and undisciplined minds, and how ready were the people to accept the marvellous illusions of hysterical devotees, are seen in the account of the Beata given by Peter Martyr of Anghiera to his patron the Count of Tendilla. Not the least interesting feature of the case is the fidelity with which its grotesque details were copied by her innumerable imitators.

She was the daughter of a fanatic peasant of Piedrahita in the diocese of Ávila who seems to have carefully trained her in mystic exercises. She was wholly given up to contemplative abstraction and had so mortified the flesh with continual fasting that her digestion had almost ceased to act. In early youth she had assumed the Dominican habit, and as her reputation for sanctity spread, the visions and revelations, which

[1] Miscelánea de Zapata (Memorial Histórico Español, XI. 76).

[2] Menendez y Pelayo, II. 526.

[3] Francisco de Osuna, Tercera Parte del Libro llamado Abecedario spiritual, Trat. XXI. cap. iv. fol. 204*a* (Búrgos, 1544).

were the natural product of her abnormal mode of life acting upon a nervously excitable temperament, won for her the reputation of a prophetess. She enjoyed the most intimate relations with God, with whom she held constant converse and in whose arms she was dissolved in love. Trances were frequent in which she lay as one dead, with arms outstretched and stiffened in the form of a cross, and on emerging from them she edified her hearers with wondrous accounts of her heavenly experiences. Although ignorant of Scripture she was said to be equal to the most learned theologians, and the rapturous fervor with which she expressed her love for Christ melted the hearts of all who listened to her. Sometimes she asserted that Christ was with her, sometimes that she herself was Christ or that she was the bride of Christ. Often she held conversations with the Virgin in which she spoke for both, and they would ceremoniously contend about precedence, as when passing through a doorway the Virgin would say "The bride of so great a son should go first," to which she would reply "If you had not borne Christ I would not have been his bride; the mother of my spouse must have every honor."

That these eccentricities of a morbid brain were as yet a novelty in Spain is seen in the discussion which they excited. Many denounced them as superstitious and demanded that they be suppressed. Unfortunately this was not done. The Beata had many zealous believers, among whom were the powers of the land. King Ferdinand encouraged the belief by visiting her and expressing his confidence in her inspiration. Cardinal Ximenes, who as inquisitor general had jurisdiction over the matter, argued that she was filled with divine wisdom. The controversy ran high and as the only mode of determining it the matter was referred to the Holy See for judgment. Julius II. appointed his legate, Giovanni Ruffo of Friuli and the Bishops of Búrgos and Vich a commission to examine the Beata and to suppress the scandal if it were found to be merely female levity. What conclusion

they reached as to the reality of her intercourse with God Peter Martyr could not ascertain, but as they discharged her without reproof, we may assume that they decided in her favor.[1] The precedent was of evil import and gave the Inquisition ample work in the future.

Thus the possibility was admitted that a devotee could be filled with the Holy Spirit and be divinely illuminated, and that this condition could be attained by assiduous devotion to mental prayer and abstraction, accompanied by maceration, and exhibiting itself in ecstasies and trances. The admission was perilous, for the fortunate individual thus favored could evidently not deem himself subjected to the restraints of obedience; he drew his inspiration from the same source as the Church itself, and if its commands conflicted with those of his interior voice his allegiance was due to the latter. There were some, like St. Teresa de Ávila, whose rare humility enabled them to reconcile one with the other, but there was danger on the one hand that self-assertion would follow the dictates of passion or inclination disguised as inspirations from God, or on the other that impostors might adopt a career affording them opportunity to acquire popular veneration and gratify their instincts. Of this we have an instance occurring soon after the affair of Piedrahita. Fray Antonio de Pastrana, custodian of the Franciscan province of Castile, reports to Cardinal Ximenes the misdeeds of a contemplative *fraile* of Ocaña who was "illuminated with the darkness of Satan." God had revealed to him that he shou'd engender on holy women a number of prophets who would reform the world; but the worthy custodian put an untimely end to this promising method of reformation by incarcerating the *alumbrado* and subjecting

[1] Petri Anglerii Epistt. 428, 431 (Ed. Elzevir. 1670, pp. 223, 225).—Llorente (Hist. Critique, I. 362) says that the Inquisition followed with an investigation, but that she escaped through the favor of the king and the inquisitor general. His information however is evidently confined to the account in Peter Martyr which says nothing of this, and it is wholly unlikely.

him to so active a treatment that in a few days he acknowledged his error.[1]

Thus we find mysticism and illuminism fairly planted in Spanish soil where they were to grow with such rank luxuriance, in both orthodox and heterodox directions. In the threatening rapidity of this growth it became important for the Church to differentiate accurately between orthodoxy and heterodoxy, but the task was by no means easy, for they faded imperceptibly into one another. The difficulty was increased by the fact that the policy of the Church was by no means consistent. What it praised at one time it persecuted at another. Santa Teresa and San Juan de la Cruz were canonized after undergoing tribulations more or less sharp for their opinions, and their canonization did not prevent their teachings and practices from being denounced as heretical in the person of Molinos, whose Quietism was scarce more exaggerated than that of Osuna, Teresa or Luis de Granada. The *Abecedario spiritual* of Osuna escaped animadversion by the censorship, while the *Oracion y Meditacion* of Luis, though a work of comparatively moderated mysticism, was promptly prohibited.[2]

In this nebulous field of speculation, thus filled with heretical pitfalls, one cannot feel sure of accurately defining

[1] Vicente de la Fuente, Historia Eclesiástica de España, III. 102 (Ed. 1855).

[2] The *Abecedario* wholly escaped condemnation in the Indexes of the sixteenth century; in that of Sotomayor (1640) only two unimportant passages are expurgated. Yet already in 1559 the Index of Valdés prohibits the works of Luis de Granada (Reusch, Die Indices, p. 224). In the Index of Quiroga (Ibid. p. 380) there is an attempt to explain this by saying that the books of authors highly reputed for piety, such as Francisco de Borja, Luis de Granada, Juan de Ávila and others have been forbidden because writings have been falsely attributed to them, or heretics have interpolated them, or they contain matters intended in a Catholic sense which may be perverted by the enemies of the faith. The censors of Granada, indeed, objected to Luis de Granada's first work, telling him that he taught a singular doctrine, that he wished to establish too great a familiarity between God and man, and to make men saints on earth.—Giovanni da Capugnano, Vita del P. Luigi Granata.

the boundaries of what, in the sixteenth century, was admitted to be orthodoxy, but, roughly outlined, it was something like this. Meditation, in which the mind was active, had always to the true mystic been an object rather of contempt—at most a stepping-stone from which to reach the loftier regions of contemplation, elevated beyond the reach of reason.[1] The foundation of the system was contemplation or "mental prayer"—*recojimiento* or the concentration and abstraction of the faculties, abstraction from all external things and concentration upon God. To attain this efficacious means were found in the mortification of the flesh—fasting, scourging, the hair shirt and other devices familiar to ascetics.[2] The devotee was instructed to seek some dark place so that nothing external might divert the senses. He was to avoid thought and reason and was told to fix his mind on God or on the Passion of Christ. With practice, the intellect could thus be made wholly to disappear; the soul threw off the fetters of the flesh; filled with the intense longing of divine love it became conscious only of God; will and intelligence were absorbed in the Divine Essence and the soul was reunited to its Creator. "Oh how ineffable," exclaims Francisco de Osuna, "is the calm in which God and the soul are united in love, when He comes down like a stream of peace, when words cease and the soul is silent, for it knows not what to ask when all its wishes are fulfilled! Love sleeps not, but the intellect sleeps, and the will is at rest; then, indeed, is the soul united to God and becomes one spirit with Him."[3] This is virtually the Quietism so severely condemned in Molinos and Madame Guyon. As Osuna says "Everything in nature tends to repose, which is the object and goal of all

[1] Richardi de S. Victor Benjamin major Lib. I. c. iii. iv.—Gerson is de Mystica Theologia Practica, P. I. Consid. xxiv.—Molinos, Guide Spirituelle, Introd. No. 1.

[2] Luis de Granada, Trattato dell' Oratione et della Meditatione. Tradotto per M. Vincenzo Buondi, Vinegia, 1561, cap. xxxi. p. 117.

[3] Abecedario spiritual, P. III. Trat. XXI. cap. iii. fol. 203*a*.

things. In the same way man should seek for the quietude of his soul."[1] Luis de Granada, the most moderate of the Spanish mystics, tells us that the intellect and the will are to repose wholly in God: this is the most perfect state of contemplation, to which we should all earnestly aspire, for then the soul has reached its goal; it no longer wanders in search of a greater fire of love, but enjoys the love acquired and reposes in it as the fulfilment of all its desires.[2] Osuna's greatest disciple, Santa Teresa, however, regards this quietude as one of the intermediate steps through which the soul ascends to union with God. At first, she tells us, there is an interior concentration felt in the soul, as though it possessed other senses than the external ones and had escaped the disturbing influence of the latter. In this stage perception and will are not lost, but they exist only to be filled with God. From this concentration generally comes internal quietude and peace; the soul feels that it wants nothing; talking, praying, meditating fatigues it; it wishes only to love. Commonly this produces a slumber of the faculties, but they are not so absorbed or suspended that it can be called ecstasy, nor is it in any way Union. Often the soul knows that the will is united to God while the intellect and memory are free to work in His service. When there is Union of all the faculties it is very different; then they can do nothing, for the understanding disappears. The will loves rather than perceives; it does not perceive that it loves or what it does. "It seems to me," she says, "that there is no memory or thought, nor are the senses awake, so that the soul can be the more filled with what it enjoys. I cannot describe this state, but it appears to me the greatest grace that the Lord gives us on this spiritual path."[3] San Juan de la Cruz, who was the foremost disciple of Santa Teresa, and who ranks next to her as a spiritual guide, is equally emphatic in his description of

[1] Abecedario spiritual, Trat. XXI. cap. i. fol. 198*b*.

[2] Oratione et Meditatione, cap. lxiv. p. 294.

[3] Santa Teresa, Libro de las Relaciones (Carta XVIII. of Palafox).

this supernal state. There is a trace of pantheism in his assertion that God exists in the souls of all his creatures; when man brings his will into full conformity with that of God, his soul is transformed into God and becomes God by participation.[1] This giving of himself to God and of God to him, says Osuna, is so complete that God appears to be wholly in the man, and the man, if not enlightened by faith, might almost say that God is wholly included in him and there is nothing of God elsewhere.[2] All this approaches perilously near the teachings of Quietism from which deductions so abhorrent to the moral sense were drawn by the ingenuity of the Roman Inquisition, but Juan de la Cruz goes even further than this when he says that he who hates his soul shall save it; those who devote themselves to virtue, prayer and mortification are in the wrong path; they seek the luxury of converse with God and are really enemies of the Cross of Christ. What God wishes is the negation of all the faculties and the annihilation of the will.[3]

[1] Subida del Monte Carmelo, II. 5 (Obras espirituales, Barcelona, 1619, pp. 101, 103). In the *Noche escura del Alma* he describes the Union of the soul with God—

O noche que juntasse
Amado con amada
Amada en el amado transformada.
* * * * * *
Quedéme y olvidéme
El rostro recliné sobre el amado.
Cesó todo y dexéme
Dexando mi cuydado
Entre las azucenas olvidado.
(Obras, p. 351.)

[2] Abecedario spiritual, P. III. Trat. XIII. cap. iv. fol. 123*a*.—"Este darse el hombre a Dios y Dios al hombre es una dadiva tan perfectamente dada que quando se da parece que Dios este en el hombre todo y enteramente; quiero dezir que si la fe no alumbrasse al hombre que tiene a Dios quasi diria que en si se incluye Dios todo y que fuera de si no esta."

The blessed Angela of Foligno, a mystic of the fourteenth century, had frequent visions of God in which he would say to her "I am thou and thou art I;" but in 1744 we find Doctor Amort qualifying this as of questionable orthodoxy.—Amort de Revelationibus etc. Privatis, P. II. p. 198.

[3] Subida del Monte Carmelo, II. 7 (pp. 109-11).

Had the writings of San Juan de la Cruz been treated as harshly as those of the later Quietists he would have fared as badly. The doctrine condemned

This rapturous spiritual intoxication was inculcated, not as an occasional indulgence, but as the main duty of life. If, says Osuna, you have any manual labor to perform, you must not on that account omit the *recojimiento*, but must practise it internally and externally as much as possible, and thus progressively mortify yourself. Moreover, if this practice so grows upon you that you become unskilful in the things you have to do, and you forget them, and do not understand them as well as formerly, and find yourself unfitted for your external duties, so that you seem to have lost your human wits and cannot light a fire or kindle a taper or gather up crumbs, you must not be surprised and abandon the *recojimiento*, for the soul passes through this state to become wise in all things. He adds that prelates and gentlemen should devote two hours a day to it, and that he has known great merchants who, in spite of their affairs, practised this holy abstraction and carried it to an extraordinary extent.[1] San Pedro de Alcántara shows to what degree these spiritual indulgences were abused when, in a manual intended for

in Molinos was that the soul must abandon its will to God with the most perfect resignation. Then it listens to God and speaks with him as if it and he were the only ones in the world (Guide Spirituelle, Introd. No. 17). The torments and struggles through which it passes are the means which God uses for its purification. It should submit to them passively, abandoning itself to the will of God and making no effort itself (Ibid. Lib. I. c. vii. No. 14).

This, which was so rigorously and cruelly suppressed under the name of Quietism, had long passed unchallenged as one of the veriest commonplaces of mysticism. Molinos and Madame Guyon did not express it with any more clearness than Rulman Merswin in the fourteenth century (De IX. Rupibus Libellus, cap. xxviii.–xxxi. *ap.* H. Susonis Opera, Laur. Surio interpr. Colon. Agripp. 1588, pp. 403–12).

Jerónimo Gracian, the spiritual director of Santa Teresa, says of mental prayer: "Algunos la llaman contemplacion; otros, *quietud de espíritu;* otros, morar dentro de sí; otros, centro del corazon; otros, atencion interior, ò centro de la voluntad."—Itinerario de la Perfeccion, cap. ix. § 1.

[1] Abecedario spiritual, P. III. Trat. XV. cap. ii. fol. 137. Osuna is here speaking of what he calls general *recojimiento*, which was to be practised while attending to other duties. When the devotee shut himself up in darkness and solitude it was special *recojimiento*.

general circulation among the people, he cautions his readers against excessive abandonment to these exercises. There must be lucid intervals in which the intellect is allowed to work or else the health suffers, which he says happens not infrequently to those who are immoderate.[1]

This indicates the revenge taken by the body on the soul which thus tyrannically abused it. The balance between flesh and spirit could not be thus destroyed without disastrous effects on both. Osuna describes for us the physical results of this hyper-excitation of the nervous centres. In the divine abstraction all control over the limbs is lost, and when the devotee emerges he is as though crippled and unable to move. In many persons it was accompanied with involuntary gesticulations and with screams peculiarly loud and piercing, or with heavy groans which no self-control could stop. One devotee had his head so habitually bent backwards that in order to elude observation he would talk about the roof and its timbers as though he were intently considering them. The appetite failed and all food became tasteless. Healthful sleep was replaced with spiritual excitement. The novice was told that he should not take more than six hours of sleep a day, and that he should employ scourging or other efficacious means, if necessary, to keep himself awake, while one more advanced must content himself with five. The power of sleep thus was gradually lost; perfected adepts customarily slept but three hours a day and their slumbers were uneasy and broken. There was one who confidentially told a friend that in seventeen years he had not slept as much as men are wont to do in four months.[2] San Pedro de Alcántara, indeed, for

[1] S. Pedro de Alcántara, De la Oracion y Meditacion, I. xii.; II. v.

[2] Abecedario spiritual, P. III. Trat. VI. cap. iv. fol. 56; Trat. IX. cap. vi. fol. 91–2; Trat. XIII. cap. v. fol. 126*a*; Trat. XV. cap. iii. fol. 138*b*.—All this was well understood by the older mystics. See Henry Herp's description of the crazy gesticulations and cries of the devotees who lost all control over themselves when flooded with divine love.—Specchio di Perfettione, P. III. cap. xli. (Venetia, 1676, p. 185).

forty years averaged not more than an hour and a half of sleep, and during this period he never lay down to rest.[1] We can, in fine, readily believe Santa Teresa when she tells us that the bodily agony which accompanied the perfected forms of contemplation was the severest that the human frame can endure.[2]

The mental condition thus superinduced was a veritable hysteria, assuming various forms, of which the most usual consisted in ecstasies and trances. Sometimes it manifested itself in complete insensibility, as in one case in which the devotee was found apparently lifeless in bed and only recovered while being arrayed in his shroud: he declared that he could have been cut in pieces without feeling it.[3] More commonly the attack was one in which the soul seemed to leave the body, entering into converse with God and enjoying divine revelations. This, which has always been a prominent feature of advanced mysticism, was the development which principally attracted popular veneration, and we shall meet with so many cases of it that Santa Teresa's description of its subjective phenomena is not without interest for us. When mental prayer or abstraction reached the degree of Union with God, she tells us that there was ecstasy or trance, which might be of various degrees of intensity. When great, the hands were stiff and sometimes stretched rigidly like sticks; the body remained in the position which it occupied when seized, either standing or kneeling; the breath was shortened so that speech was lost, and the eyes were closed; if it con-

[1] Santa Teresa, Libro de su Vida, cap. xxvii.

[2] Santa Teresa, Moradas, VI. i.—Brierre de Boismont (*Des Hallucinations*, 3e Ed. Paris, 1862, p. 305) divides ecstasy into physiological and pathological, but he admits the impossibility of strictly differentiating these two states, and also that complications result from intervening hysteria. The experiences of the Spanish mystics are not peculiar to them, but are to be found in all races and ages. Johann Engelbrecht, who had been transported to heaven, used to pass one, two, or three weeks without eating, and on one occasion never closed his eyes for nine months (Ib. p. 304).

[3] Abecedario spiritual, Trat. IX. cap. vi. fol. 92*b*.

tinued for a space, the limbs ached on recovery. The soul was so filled with the joy of the Lord that it seemed to forget to animate the body. It was as though the Lord desired the soul to perceive what it enjoyed, and many things of the Divine Majesty were frequently revealed to it. In the desire to know and praise God the soul forgot itself, and the rapture and sweetness of this state so far transcended earthly pleasures that the soul habituated to these delights necessarily held the things of earth in small esteem. Teresa defines the difference between ecstasy and trance as consisting in the gradual fading away of outward consciousness in ecstasy; the senses become extinguished and the soul lives wholly in God: while in trance there is a sudden seizure, with only a single notice given by the Divine Majesty in the depths of the soul, so quickly that it seems as though the Master snatched it. The soul appears to leave the body in order to fly to the arms of the Lord who bears it whither he wills.[1]

With regard to the crucial matter of visions and revelations, Teresa tells us "Though I do not see with the eyes of my soul the persons of the Godhead who speak to me, yet I know them with a strange certainty. And though they present themselves as distinct persons, the soul knows them to be One God. I do not remember that it has seemed to me that the Lord speaks to me, but only his Humanity." Yet in her latest work she tells of having visions of Christ, fleeting as a lightning flash but leaving ineffaceable impressions, and in them He sometimes speaks and reveals the greatest secrets.[2]

[1] Santa Teresa, Libro de las Revelaciones, viii. (Carta XVIII. of Palafox). In the mystical language of all ages we hear much of the soul entering into itself and rising above itself. Teresa very sensibly rejects these efforts to describe the incomprehensible, which only darkened obscurity: "Dicen que el alma se entra dentro de si, y otros veces que sube sobre si: por este lenguaje no sabré yo aclarar nada."—Moradas, IV. iii.

[2] Santa Teresa, Libro de las Relaciones, viii. (Carta XVIII. of Palafox).—Moradas, VI. ix. Cf. Carta CCCXXXIII. (Escritos, II. 288). This last assertion of Teresa's is not without importance, for, as will be seen hereafter, the Inquisition subsequently declared against visions of God. Yet Teresa's

On Easter eve, 1579, she had an ecstasy in which the Lord ordered her to give certain instructions to the Barefooted Carmelites, the Order which she was engaged in founding, and these she duly issued for their guidance. After her death her disciple, the Venerable Catalina de Jesus similarly had frequent intercourse with her, receiving commands which she transmitted to the provincial, and thus Teresa for awhile continued to govern the Order from heaven. Teresa had no doubt as to the authenticity of her own revelations, but she wisely discouraged in others the habit of having them, and one of her *post-mortem* communications was forcibly directed against it.[1]

In this caution Teresa merely echoed the opinion of all the wiser mystics, for visions and revelations were the besetting sin of the class and the *beatas revelanderas* became a nuisance, which, as we shall see, the Inquisition was obliged to repress severely. Francisco de Osuna had already argued that it was impossible for the soul imprisoned in the flesh to see God, who is pure spirit, and he broadly intimated his disbelief in the revelations which were so commonly bruited about by ignorant enthusiasts for self-glorification.[2] The calm moderation of Luis de Granada was equally emphatic in warning the devotee against this prevailing weakness. He denounces these manifestations as an evidence and a cause of illusions

writings are held to be inspired. Vicente de la Fuente says (Escritos de S. Teresa, I. 406): "Que las obras de Santa Teresa sean inspirados no lo puede dudar ningun católico, despues que la Iglesia lo ha declarada así por sentencia del romano Pontifice en su espediente de beatificacion."

It is interesting to compare these experiences with those of Emanuel Swedenborg, who in his ecstasies held continual converse with spirits and learned all the mysteries of the life to come. See his *Arcana Cœlestia*, T. I. pp. 65, 113, 192, 262, etc. (Tubingæ, 1833).

[1] Palafox, Obras, VII., 345, 365–98.

[2] Abecedario spiritual, P. III. Trat. III. cap. ii. fol. 29–30. "Que por una poca de lumbre que an rescibido de Dios, o por algunas revelaciones a que dan mas credito que devrian se estienden en el hablar de Dios mucho mas que lo que deven; no hablando para doctrinar a los otros sino para ser ellos tenidos en admiracion."

and diabolical deceptions—"We need not fear to disobey God in refusing credence to them. If he wishes to reveal anything he will do so in a manner that admits of no doubt."[1] Padre Jerónimo Gracian, one of the most sensible disciples of Santa Teresa, tells us that his prayer to God was not to give him riches or honors or visions, revelations and miracles, through which men acquire the reputation of saints,[2] and he enumerates the desire for supernatural manifestations among the obstacles to perfection which the devotee must suppress.[3] Yet in spite of these warnings the fashion continued to spread. Visions and revelations became so much a matter of business that when Teresa's new Order of Barefooted Carmelites was torn with dissensions the leading *beatas* of the two factions had ample store of antagonistic revelations of the divine will wherewith to confound their adversaries.[4] They became simple weapons of partizan warfare. From this it was but a step to manufacture revelations said to have been vouchsafed to Santa Teresa respecting the independence of Portugal and the extinction of the Jesuits.[5] Public opinion had been educated to the point that such things were politically useful.

The power to work miracles was naturally not denied to those who stood in relations so intimate to God. In the bull of canonization of Santa Teresa, issued in 1622, Gregory XV. not only accepts as indubitable her visions and revelations, but tells us that Christ formally took her as his spouse; that when receiving the sacrament she saw the body of Christ so perfectly that she in no way envied the blessed in heaven

[1] Luis de Granada, De Oratione et Meditatione, cap. lvii. p. 272. Cf. S. Pedro de Alcántara, De la Oracion y Meditacion, II. 5.

Yet, as we shall see, this wise caution did not preserve Luis de Granada in his old age from falling a victim to the wiles of María de la Visitacion.

[2] Mármol, Vida del Padre Jerónimo Gracian, cap. xv. (Escritos de S. Teresa, II. 471). Yet Padre Gracian had frequent visions of Santa Teresa after her death, and communications from her (Ibid. cap. xvii. p. 478).

[3] Itinerario de la Perfeccion, cap. v. § 2.

[4] Vicente de la Fuente (Escritos de S. Teresa, II. p. xxix.).

[5] Escritos de S. Teresa, I. 348; II. 537.

who enjoyed the beatific vision of God; that during life she shone in miracles and cured the sick with a touch. At her death-bed the bystanders saw her already in glory: one beheld the bed surrounded with angels, another saw heavenly lights hovering over her, another witnessed figures in white garments entering her cell, another a white dove fly to heaven from her mouth, while a withered tree near the sanctified spot suddenly burst into full bloom. After her death she appeared to a nun and said that she had not died of disease but of the intolerable fire of divine love.[1] In the communications which she received from God sometimes future events were revealed to her, and these all came duly to pass. That she should be lifted from the ground by the ardor of her devotion was an experience too usual with saints for her to escape it. Twice this occurred to her in church in spite of her efforts to prevent it; then she prayed to God not to favor her in this manner and there were no more such manifestations.[2] Still we are told that when, in 1572, she summoned Juan de la Cruz to Ávila as spiritual director of her convent del Encarnacion, and was discussing with him through the grille the mystery of the Trinity, both became so filled with divine ardor that they rose from the floor to the ceiling of the room.[3] When Juan de la Cruz celebrated mass his face shone with such glory that the eye could scarce rest upon it.[4] Bishop Yepes tells us that he found by experience that Teresa could read the thoughts and predict the future. She told him that at one time she had had almost incessant trances—the simple name of God would throw her into one. When writing she

[1] Salazar, Anamnesis Sanctorum Hispanorum, T. V. p. 529.

[2] Alban Butler, Vies des Saints, VII. 527, 544.

[3] Heppe, Geschichte der quietistischen Mystik, p. 24.

The gift of miracles was not vouchsafed to all the perfect. Molinos tells us that there are many souls consecrated to God and rewarded with visions and revelations, but he does not grant them the power of prophecy and miracles which he bestows on others that bear the true cross with perfect humility and submission.—Guide Spirituelle, Lib. III. cap iii. No. 13.

[4] Relacion sumaria de la Vida de Juan de la Cruz, § iii. (Obras, p. 9).

would sometimes pass into an ecstasy and on recovering find three or four pages written unconsciously, which were evidently inspired. A continuance of this, she said, would have killed her, and for the last fourteen years of her life she ceased to have them, but then her existence was a continual prayer, and God was always present to her without her being in a state of ecstasy.[1] San Juan de la Cruz was equally gifted with the spirit of prophecy and the power of reading the heart.[2]

It is necessary to understand these supernatural gifts, attributed by the Church to those who had reached the state of mystic perfection, in order to follow the effects of these teachings upon the development of popular beliefs. So shining an example as that of Santa Teresa was sure to produce a host of imitators, especially among women of impressionable temperament. It was no less certain to foster a crowd of impostors, and the task of distinguishing between those who merely deceived themselves and those who sought to deceive others was by no means easy, especially when every devotee who wrought herself up to ecstasies and trances was speedily surrounded by a legion of credulous disciples and greedy friars who exaggerated her marvels to the utmost, whether from local pride or from the speculative benefits accruing from skilful exploitation.

DANGERS OF MYSTICISM.

It might seem that these reveries and ecstasies were of small importance except to the individuals who thus found happiness in the annihilation of the body for the exaltation of the soul. At the most it could apparently only increase in some degree the superstition of the masses, who venerated the devotee as a being specially endowed with divine grace. Such had been

[1] Escritos de Santa Teresa, T. I. pp. 567, 569–70.

[2] Relacion sumaria, ℣ v. (Obras, pp. 13 *sqq.*).

the feeling of the Church during the middle ages, so long as mysticism was uncontaminated with pantheism, and the immunity enjoyed by the Beata of Piedrahita, after an investigation by a papal commission, shows that such exuberances of the devotional spirit were looked upon with a favorable eye.

Still there were dangers lurking in the vagaries possible to the half-crazed brains of enthusiasts, as we have seen in the case of the contemplative *fraile* of Ocaña. The prevalent vice of "solicitation"—the seduction of spiritual daughters in the confessional—might assume the guise of obedience to inward commands from on high. Still more threatening was the risk that the assumption of perfectibility, gained by mental prayer or contemplation, might tend to revive the old doctrine of impeccability. This, when persecution came, was assumed to be the belief which principally distinguished the *Alumbrado* or *Illuminé*, from the orthodox mystic. It facilitated the exciting of a healthy popular odium by attributing the foulest excesses to the initiated, and it was always the point to which the investigations of the Inquisition were specially directed. Even mystics recognized as orthodox came perilously near affording grounds for inferring claims to impeccability. When San Juan de la Cruz, about 1565, was consecrated priest, at his first mass he prayed for the grace that he should in future be preserved from mortal sin, and that for the sins of the past he might render full satisfaction during life, when the ardent flood of devotion which he thereupon felt overcome him was a proof to him that his petition was granted.[1] Santa Teresa declares that souls which reach the highest grade will not commit mortal sins, though they may inadvertently commit venial ones, and be tormented with the fear of being in mortal sin without knowing it.[2]

[1] Heppe, p. 23.

[2] Moradas, VII. iv.—"Digo pecados veniales, que de los mortales que ellas entiendan estan libres, aunque no seguras que ternán algunos que no entienden, que no les será pequeño tormento."

Practically, moreover, there was an assumption of impeccability in the belief that the will of the perfected adept was at one with the will of God, and that he thus was directly under divine guidance. Francisco de Osuna explains the name of *union* given to mental prayer because in it man becomes one spirit with God, through an interchange of wills, where the man wills nothing but what God wills and God does not depart from the will of man, so that in all things they are one.[1] Francisco Ortiz was no *Alumbrado*, but he based his defence before the Inquisition on the assumption that he was so completely under the influence of God that he could not be a heretic and that the Inquisition must be wrong —propositions which the inquisitors had no hesitation in qualifying as illusory, false, injurious to the Holy Office and savoring of heresy.[2] Archbishop Carranza teaches that the Holy Ghost becomes incorporated in the soul of the just man, banishing the spirits of wrath, avarice, pride, lust, and the rest; that he participates in the divine nature and becomes by grace what Christ was by nature.[3]

This indicates what was the crowning error of the mystics, what led to the dreaded name of *Alumbrados* or Illuminati

[1] Abecedario spiritual, P. III. Trat. VI. cap. ii. fol. 53*a*.—"Llamase tambien union porque llegandose el hombre desta manera a Dios se haze un spirito con el por un trocamiento de voluntades que ni el hombre quiere otra cosa de lo que Dios quiere ni Dios se aparta de la voluntad del hombre, mas a todo son a una como las cosas que perfectamente estan unidas."

[2] Eduard Böhmer, Francisca Hernandez und Frai Francisco Ortiz, Leipzig, 1865, p. 163.

[3] Comentarios, P. I. Art. 7, cap. iii. fol. 113*b*.—"A todos estos espiritus es contrario el Espiritu sancto y à todos los alança de la persona donde el entra. A los furiosos haze mansos y à los avaros liberales, à los deshonestos haze castos, à los mentirosos haze hablar verdad."

"Se haze una copula y una union entre el Espiritu sancto y el nuestro que por virtud del dicho ayuntamiento se hazen una cosa el Espiritu sancto y nuestra alma . . . . lo que tiene Jesu Christo por naturaleza tenemos nosotros por gracia."—Ibid. cap. v. fol. 116*b*.

This was by no means original with the Spanish mystics. Those of Germany in the fourteenth century taught the same doctrine.—Jundt, Amis de Dieu, Paris, 1879, pp. 106–7.

to designate those whom the Church denounced as heretics. It assumed that there was an interior voice from God, or an illumination of the soul by the Holy Ghost, which served as an infallible guide for thought and action. This was the *Light within* of George Fox and his followers, and the extravagances of the early Quakers show to what disagreeable follies it might lead. Luis de Granada tells his disciples to let themselves be guided by the Holy Spirit, which knows what we need and will inspire and draw us to it.[1] To this interior light, derived from the union of the Holy Ghost with the soul, Carranza ascribed the power of understanding creation more perfectly than by any natural science and of discerning infallibly between points of faith, which was claiming the right of private judgment in a manner liable at any moment to lead to heresy.[2] It thus substituted a higher law and a supreme test for the obedience which was held to be the plainest duty of the believer in matters of faith and conduct. Even the humility of Santa Teresa could revolt when thus sustained. Before her spiritual gifts were recognized she was ordered not to take communion so often and to perform only the devotions prescribed by the Carmelite Rule: for two years she obeyed and was a prey to bitterness inconsolable, till one day when almost desperate she heard a voice—"My daughter, fear not, it is I who will not abandon thee." This at once filled her with interior light, restored her peace and gave her strength to maintain against all men the truth of her confidence in God.[3] In fact, San Pedro de Alcántara told her that she ought not to ask the opinions of theologians concerning her acts, for the guidance of God must of course be

[1] Oratione et Meditatione, cap. xxix.

[2] Comentarios, P. I. Art. 8, cap. v. fol. 121*a*.—"Por esta lumbre sabemos lo que avemos de creer en las cosas de la religion, sabemos distinguir las cosas de la fe de las que no lo son. Por este don tenemos conocimiento en todas las cosas criadas mas claro y mas limpio que se tiene por ninguna ciencia natural."

[3] Alban Butler, Vies des Saints, VII. 536.

right.[1] One of her chief disciples, Padre Jerónimo Gracian, describes this internal illumination as though a book were opened in the centre of the soul where with a single glance is read what is required; or sometimes it comes in the form of words internally spoken by God.[2] In the group of mystics which gathered around Santa Teresa, from which the reformed barefooted Carmelite Order was developed, it seems to have been a matter of course to apply to God for instructions in all doubtful matters, and the replies appear to have been unequivocal.[3]

All this was sufficiently threatening to established orthodoxy, with its fixed and intricate theology and its political structure based upon implicit obedience, but this was by no means the only obnoxious feature of mystic theory and practice. The authority of the Church over the souls and purses of men was

1 Escritos de S. Teresa, T. I. p. 551.—"Y en los consejos evangelicos no hay que tomar parecer si será bien seguirlos ó no, ó si son observables ó no, porque es ramo de infidelidad, porque el consejo de Dios no puede dejar de ser bueno."

2 Mármol, Vida del Padre Jerónimo Gracian, cap. xvi. (Escritos de S. Teresa, II. 475).

3 Escritos de S. Teresa, I. 563.—In 1581, a year before her death, she writes: "Las hablas interiores no se han quitado, que cuando es menester me da nuestro Señor algunos avisos (Carta CCCXXXIII. Ibid. II. 288).

The power of self-deception among the mystics was unlimited. Padre Gracian was the spiritual director of Teresa, to whom she was bound to obedience. He relates that once they were debating whether they should go to Madrid or to Seville to found a convent of the new Order, when he told her to consult God; she did so for three days and reported that God ordered them to Madrid. Nevertheless he told her to go to Seville and she assented. Then he asked her why she preferred his opinion to God's will and she replied that faith told her that what he would order was the will of God and she had not the same faith in her own revelations. This is perhaps explained by his adding that it often happened that they would differ as to affairs; he would change his mind over night and on telling her so in the morning she would smile and say that she had said to God, "Lord, if thou wishest that to be done change the mind of my director and make him order it so that I may not disobey him" (Ibid. I. 555).

Of course in this region of morbid psychology it would be idle to expect consistency, yet one would hardly look for so emphatic a denial of free-will.

founded upon the power of the keys, upon the control which it possessed over salvation, upon the necessity of its ministrations to secure the pardon of the sinner, on its position as a mediator between God and man, and on its elaborate system of so-called good works through which the penitent could earn absolution for his offences. All this was seriously threatened by the theory of the mystics. However much they might protest undiminished reverence for the prescribed observances of religion, there was a more or less conscious practical denial of their necessity. Their whole system was based upon mental prayer—contemplative revery or *recojimiento*—and everything else inevitably became in comparison of small importance. San Pedro de Alcántara tells us that oral prayer is only a stepping-stone to the higher mysteries of contemplation and is to be abandoned when the latter is attained.[1] Osuna says that they who read or pray aloud or listen even with undivided attention to devotions uttered by others deceive themselves when they think by these pious works to attain that which only comes from the internal operation of the heart; such things may help in some degree, but they reach only a little way, and if we must forego either it is incomparably better to choose the self-communion of mental prayer.[2] It is well, he declares, to endure labor and fatigue like St. Paul, to meditate like Solomon on the pains of hell, to perform like Martha works of mercy for the poor, to visit the afflicted like Elisha, and to go on pilgrimages to holy places, to fast with the disciples of St. John, but those who seek for higher things will practise the mental prayer of *recojimiento*, like our Lord who sought the desert to pray in secret to his Father.[3] Oral prayer, indeed, is a positive injury to those who are advanced in mental prayer; it is true that the monk must

[1] De la Oracion y Meditacion, I. xii.

[2] Abecedario spiritual, P. III. Trat. VI. cap. ii. fol. 52*b*.

[3] Ibid. Trat. VI. cap. i. fol. 51*a*. This is simply a repetition of the doctrines of the medieval mystics, taught as early as the thirteenth century. See B. Fr. Bertholdi a Ratispona Sermones, Monachii, 1882, pp. 29, 44–5.

not omit that which is prescribed in his Rule, but he should postpone it to a time when he is not engrossed in interior devotion; those who prescribe an Ave Maria as a penance for a trifling fault are to be avoided.[1] San Juan de la Cruz is quite as emphatic: church observances and the use of images and places of worship are merely for the beginner, like the toys which amuse children; those who are advanced must liberate themselves from such habits, which to them are only a distraction from internal contemplation; they may indeed incidentally use images and churches, but their souls rest in God and forget all that appertains to the senses.[2] San Pedro de Alcántara is not so outspoken, but in his enumeration of the nine aids to devotion he significantly omits all reference to the observances of the Church, though he recommends mortification of the flesh.[3] Mortification, however, may be regarded as an open question. San Juan de la Cruz, after founding the Carmelite house of Duruelo in 1568, lived in the austerest manner, with frequent use of the discipline and wearing not only a hair shirt but a chain of which each link had a sharp point to tear the flesh.[4] It is related of Luis de Granada that after death he was found to have worn an iron chain so long that it had imbedded itself in the flesh.[5] In this he only followed his own teachings. Perhaps, he says, the greatest of all dangers is that those who have tasted the inestimable virtues of prayer and have learned that all spiritual life depends upon it, imagine that it suffices alone for salvation and neglect the other virtues. But as prayer is a good means to acquire mortification, so mortification and the other virtues are steps to acquire the perfection of prayer, and one

[1] Abecedario Spiritual, P. III. Trat. XIII. cap. iii. fol. 122*a*.

[2] Subida del Monte Carmelo, III. 38.—He had already (III. 14) denounced the Lutheran heresy of denying the sanctity of images, but he cautioned the mystic to regard them only as a means of remembering God and the saints.

[3] De la Oracion y Meditacion, II. ii.

[4] Heppe, Geschichte der quietistischen Mystik, p. 23.

[5] Giovanni da Capugnano, Vita del P. Luigi Granata.

is impossible without the other.[1] As a rule, however, mortification was only the preliminary training. The medieval mystics had taught that it was no longer requisite for the perfected adept,[2] and it was divinely revealed to the venerable mother, Francisca Lopez of Valencia, that a quarter of an hour of *recojimiento* was of higher worth than five days spent in ascetic practices—hair shirts, scourging, fasting, and sleeping on planks—for these only mortify the flesh while it purifies the soul.[3] Even works of charity were to be avoided. Luis de Granada, like Berthold of Ratisbon, warns us that the most dangerous of all temptations in the spiritual life is the desire to do good to others; a man's first duty is to himself, and this he must not endanger in the effort to save others or allow the indiscreet ardor of charity to injure himself.[4]

The most that the mystic would concede with regard to church observances was that exterior ceremonies and sacrifices derived all their virtue from the spirit in which they were performed. Without love and faith they were a weariness to God; simple faith and charity were better than all sacrifices and ceremonies.[5] Even the Cardinal Archbishop

1 Oratione et Meditatione, cap. lxii. p. 285.

2 Jundt, Amis de Dieu, p. 83.

3 Molinos, Guide Spirituelle, Lib. I. chap. xii. No. 80.

4 Oratione et Meditatione, cap. lv. p. 242.—Cf. S. Pedro de Alcántara, De la Oracion, II. iv.

All mysticism was not thus selfish and self-centred. Nicholas Estius lays great stress on the practice of all the virtues as a means of attaining union with God, and teaches that the aspirant should be as anxious for the salvation of his fellows as for his own (Exercitia Spiritualia, Exercit. vii. x.). Spanish mysticism was of a peculiarly exalted and uncompromising character.

5 Carranza, Comentarios, P. III. Obra III. cap. iii. fol. 429*a*.—"Finalmente dos cosas sabemos aqui de Dios. La una que los sacrificios y las ceremonias exteriores hechas sin charidad y sin fe no plazen à Dios antes le cansan. La otra que plaze mas à Dios la misericordia y la fe sola que no el sacrificio esterior ni la ceremonia."

When mysticism fell under the ban we can understand the expurgation of Don Quixote—"Las obras de Charidad que se hazen floxamente no tienen merito ni valen nada."—Indice de Sotomayor, p. 794.

This shows the change which had taken place within half a century. The

Manrique, the inquisitor general, who was somewhat inclined to mysticism, admitted to Osuna that fasting was as nothing compared to love and oral prayer was as nothing in comparison with contemplation.[1]

This simplification of religious observance carried with it an unacknowledged simplification of religious belief. The mystic accepted as a matter of course the traditional dogmas of the Church. He never dreamed of disputing them, but the niceties of speculative theology, which formed the pride of the schools, were to him unattractive and unimportant. In fact, his attitude to them was rather one of careless contempt. It could scarce be otherwise with those who sedulously discouraged thought and whose conception of man's highest duty was the cultivation of mental unconsciousness—self-abandonment to a revery of divine love in which the intellect was trained to remain wholly quiescent. This attitude towards the stupendous and intricate structure of belief elaborated by the schoolmen was not shown by any denial of the truth of its details but by assuming it to be unworthy of consideration. Mystical theology, says Osuna, is higher than speculative or scholastic theology; it needs no labor or learning or study, only faith and love and the grace of God.[2] When María Cazalla was tried by the Inquisition as an *alumbrada*, one of

great canonist, Azpilcueta, tells us in 1577 that prayer is worthless unless uttered in lively faith and ardent charity. Innumerable priests, he says, were consigned to purgatory or hell on account of their prayers, each one of which was at least a venial sin; and he adds that many works reputed to be good were sins, either venial or mortal (Azpilcueta de Oratione, cap. viii. Cf. cap. xx. No. 36). Yet he was no mystic. For his preference of vocal prayer to mental see cap. xvii. No. 39–41, cap. xx. No. 61. In fact he condemns prolonged mental prayer on account of the extravagances to which it led (cap. xviii. No. 104, c. xxii. No. 38), and he teaches that the Lord's Prayer contains everything that should be asked of God (Manuale Confessariorum, cap. xi. No. 1). As he was at the time papal penitentiary his opinions may be regarded as authoritative.

[1] Böhmer, Francisca Hernandez, p. 310.

[2] Abecedario Spiritual, P. III. Trat. VI. c. ii. fol. 52.—Compare Molinos, Guide Spirituelle, Lib. III. chap. xvii. No. 163–4.

the accusations against her was that she and her brother, Bishop Cazalla, ridiculed Aquinas and Scotus and the scholastic theology.[1]

During the middle ages, and as long as the peaceful supremacy of the Church remained unchallenged, all this might be passed over as the harmless eccentricity of a few enthusiasts. Even on the eve of the Reformation Erasmus derided as a new kind of Judaism the observance of exterior works without regard to their interior significance[2]; he lavished his contempt upon the schoolmen and poured ridicule to his heart's content on pilgrimages and relics and indulgences, and though he had ample store of controversies with angry friars and theologians, the princes of the Church enjoyed his satire and his books were circulated everywhere without hindrance. It was different when the Lutheran revolt threatened to revolutionize Europe and no man could say how far the movement might extend. Especially the new

[1] Melgares Marin, Procedimientos de la Inquisicion, Madrid, 1886, II. 28.

[2] "Verum Christum visibilibus rebus, ob visibilia colere, et in his fastigium religionis ponere, hinc sibi placere, hinc alios damnare, his instupescere, atque adeo immori, et (ut semel dicam) his ipsis a Christo avocari, quæ ad hoc tantum adhibentur ut ad eum conducant, hoc est nimirum a lege evangelii, quæ spiritalis est, desciscere, et in Judaismum quendam recidere. . . . . Huccine tot annorum laboribus denique perventum est ut pessimus sis et optimus tibi videare ut pro Christiano sis Judæus mutis tantum elementis serviens. . . . . Postremo ne Judaico more certis quibusdam observationibus tanquam magicis ceremoniis Deum demereri velimus docet [Paulus] eatenus opera nostra grata esse Deo quatenus ad charitatem referuntur. . . . . Concipiamus laborem et pariamus iniquitatem: semper serviamus trepidi atque humiles ceremoniis Judaicis."—Militiæ Christianæ Enchiridion, canon v. (Ed. Argentina, 1515, pp. 58, 59, 61, 69). In the later editions much of this portion is rewritten, without changing its purport.

The whole of this, embracing some twelve quarto pages, is expurgated in the 1640 Index of Sotomayor, p. 284. The only wonder is that the sensitiveness which struck out the sentence in Don Quixote did not also expunge the eloquent passage, leading up to the prohibited portion, in which Erasmus dwells with all his force and acuteness, on the worthlessness of external observances unaccompanied by charity and amendment. These observances are useful he says for the vulgar, and the perfected Christian will endure them for the sake of example.

dogma of Justification by Faith gave added importance among the conservatives to the necessity of pious works; the latter became an outer line of entrenchments which must be fortified and defended against the enemy at all hazards. Yet in 1527 Osuna boldly taught that the only requisite for justification was that the sinner should be annihilated through humility and be re-created in a state of grace, and this annihilation must comprehend the good works which he may have performed, knowing them to be useless.[1] Moreover, the mystic theory which taught that man could exalt his soul to union with God brought the Creator and the created into direct relations with each other and dispensed with intermediaries. Mysticism still believed in the seven sacraments and in transubstantiation—indeed the mystics were overfond of frequent communion and even were accustomed to take several "forms" or wafers, assuming that they thus enjoyed enhanced advantage—but when innovation was in the air and errors were sprouting everywhere, there was no saying how soon those who believed themselves under the special guidance of the Holy Ghost might learn to dispense with the ministrations of priesthood and might dispute the power of the keys. The system which brought man face to face with God diminished the importance of the mediator, a first step of which the logical conclusion was his final expulsion. It was an approach to Lutheranism and to justification by faith —the mystic was a Lutheran *in posse*, and though he might still profess obedience to the Holy See it was a profession merely. In the mystical manuals it is noteworthy how slender are the references to papal authority and how completely indulgences are ignored as a means of salvation. It was perfectly natural that in the trial of María Cazalla in

[1] Abecedario Spiritual, P. III. Trat. XIX. cap. iii. fol. 183*a*.—"Y assi para la justificacion del pecador no es menestra otra cosa sino que este anichilado por humildad y no contradiga por pecado. Y assi de no nada sera recreado y sacado al ser de gracia . . . . y esta anichilacion ha de ser aun en las buenas obras morales que hiziere conociendo ser inutiles."

1532 she should be formally accused by the prosecuting officer of the Inquisition as a believer in the errors of Luther and the Alumbrados.[1]

In this, as in the case of the vernacular Scriptures and the censorship of the press, the Lutheran revolt changed the aspect of affairs and the attitude of the Church towards those who wandered from the beaten track. Before 1517 independence of thought and speech could be condoned as a matter of little moment, like the licence which an absolute sovereign can allow to a contented people in time of peace. After the German outbreak had gathered headway the Church was in the face of the enemy ; it virtually proclaimed a state of siege and invoked martial law for the suppression of insubordination. As regards the mystics the situation is shown in the trial of Francisco Ortiz by the Inquisition in 1531, when he was called upon to retract the proposition that the greatest of truths is that he who eats with greater love is more worthy than he who fasts with less. This was qualified as not false in itself but as tending to the disregard of penitential works at a time when many heresies were arising against the necessity of penance.[2] This sensitive opportunism was inevitable, and practices which had passed unchallenged for centuries were called in question when experience showed to what disagreeable results their development might lead. The extravagances of the Anabaptists in 1534–5 afforded a further warning as to the necessity of repressing mystic ardor before it should become uncontrollable and spread like a fierce contagion among the masses. Mystic writers like Hendrik Herp and Dionysius Rickel, who had long been regarded as models

[1] Melgares Marim, Procedimientos de la Inquisicion, II. 86, 88, 90.

[2] Böhmer, Francisca Hernandez, p. 159.—" Propositio licet in se non falsa videtur dare occasionem cessandi ab operibus pœnitentiæ occasione hujus temporis in quo multæ hæreses insurgunt contra actus pœnitentiæ."

Another proposition of similar import is characterized as " male sonans, in his temporibus maxime, et periculosa" (Ibid.).

for imitation, were either prohibited wholly or their books were only allowed after careful expurgation.[1]

The process of repression was a slow and intermittent one, of which the most noteworthy characteristic was its inconsistency. The Inquisition, in fact, had no easy task in the duty which was thus thrust upon it. The mystics were multiplying rapidly; they claimed to be obedient children of the Church and in general their tenets had long been accepted as orthodox; their holiness of life and the miraculous powers ascribed to them won for them intense popular veneration. They could not be condemned in mass without including in the sentence a long line of saints who had taught the same principles and followed the same practices. Yet it was impossible that such a development of mystic ardor should occur without some of the devotees pushing their extravagance into new directions and affording opportunity for repression without incurring the appearance at least of condemning orthodox doctrines. It was equally impossible that popular veneration, so easily aroused, should not stimulate impostors who by claiming peculiar graces traded upon the superstition of those around them. The first class became known as *Alumbrados* or Illuminati, the second as *Embusteros* or swindlers, and the Inquisition set vigorously to work to suppress the one and to detect the other. It is not easy at this distance of time and with imperfect records to formulate a principle which may have guided the Holy Office in its dealings with these offenders, except that it looked with suspicion upon them all; that it was always ready to prosecute them, and that it felt its duty to be the suppression of mysticism in general. If some eluded its grasp and if others escaped from its hands after tribulations more or less severe, to be subsequently enrolled in the catalogue of saints, one cannot help thinking that sometimes more depended on the temperament of the judges and on their methods than on the

[1] Reusch, Die Indices, pp. 233, 239, 486.

orthodoxy or good faith of the accused. When the inquisitor was resolved on conviction, the means at his disposal were adequate, as a rule, to accomplish the desired result. Accusation was easy from enemies and rivals, whose names were sacredly kept secret, and there were few who could resist the wearing torture of years of hopeless imprisonment or the persuasive application of the *jarra de aqua* in the water torture. When the annual Edict of Denunciations described the signs which the Inquisition had come to attribute to the *Alumbrados* everyone knew how to shape an accusation and the character of evidence requisite to support it.

In the early trials the matters alleged against the accused take a wide range, showing how vague was the conception of the errors attributed to the dreaded mystics. Thus in the accusation drawn up against María Cazalla, in 1532, she was declared to disbelieve in transubstantiation; that she ridiculed those who sought God in temples of stone and not in men who are living temples, and those who ornamented churches thinking thereby to please God; that she declared confession to be a waste of time and that but for public opinion she would take the sacrament without it; that she laughed at those who heard mass frequently; that she said there were much higher things than the Passion of Christ for the contemplation of the devout, and that prayers, fasting, scourging, visiting the churches, reverencing images and other such acts were imperfect things to be held in light esteem; that she defended Luther and depreciated scholastic theology, saying that Christ was lost in its sophisms, while she exalted Erasmus as an evangelist who ought to be canonized; that she attributed more authority to Isabel de la Cruz, a condemned *alumbrada*, than to St. Paul; that she denied free-will; that she called religious ceremonies Judaism; that she valued as naught the papal bulls and indulgences, stigmatizing them as purchased Christianity; that she regarded the religious Orders as all flesh and ceremonial; that she laughed at the sermons of the preachers; that she regarded

exterior acts of worship as imperfections; that she did not believe there had been such persons as Magdalen or the three Maries, or that St. Anna was married three times; that it was a mortal sin to desire any worldly good for the love of God; that when on her knees, at the elevation of the host, she kept her hands under her mantle and her eyes on the ground or looking at the entrance door; that she held marriage to be a higher state than virginity, and said that she had conceived her children without pleasure and that she cared for them no more than for those of her neighbors; that as a teacher and dogmatizer of the Alumbrados she had publicly taught these things, saying that exterior acts of adoration, prayer and humiliation are imperfect and to be rejected; that she defamed the Holy Office, saying that it did not proceed rightly or understand the Alumbrados.[1]

Francisco Ortiz, whose trial occurred at the same time, was called upon to retract a list of sixty-three errors. Many of these related to matters personal to his own case, but among those of more general significance may be enumerated his ascribing to a *beata* then under trial the power of working miracles and that she was the bride of Christ; his claiming to be under divine guidance and that the grace and strength which God had bestowed upon him while in prison proved that he was not in mortal sin; that he could not recant what his conscience told him to be true; that he belittled externalities and ceremonies; that he could have certainty from divine evidence that he was not under demonic illusion; that the feelings of his conscience were sufficient to prove that he was not a heretic or a mortal sinner; that the goodness of God would not permit him to fall into error while he prayed so earnestly to be preserved from it; that God is in the souls of the righteous more completely than in the Eucharist. In the long enumeration of his errors the three noteworthy points are the underestimate of external works, the assertion of the right of

[1] Melgares Marin, II. 79–88.

private judgment, springing from conviction of direct relations with God and leading to disobedience, and the veneration, amounting almost to worship, paid to certain miracle-working women, in whom the mystics recognized special divine gifts and whom they characterized as brides of Christ—a feature which we shall see as a constant factor in Spanish belief, from the Beata of Piedrahita to the present time.[1]

In these cases there is no allusion to the claim of impeccability. Of this, a dogma so peculiarly calculated to excite popular odium, we hear much but see little. It became, however, in the Inquisition, one of the chief characteristic signs whereby to distinguish between the orthodox mystic and the Alumbrado. Occasionally, doubtless, it was employed by an unchaste priest to seduce his spiritual daughters, but I am inclined to think that as a rule it was a figment of popular rumor and that its acknowledgment was extorted by intolerable torture.[2] Another distinguishing error related to the control of the thoughts while engaged in mental prayer. As to this the mystics were divided into two schools. One of these held, as we have seen above, that all thought was to be excluded, even pious thought, and this, although taught by the most orthodox mystics, was one of the errors specified in the final sentence of Francisco Ortiz.[3] The other practised a variety of *recojimiento* known as *dejamiento* or abandonment, in which the soul abandoned itself to God and allowed free course to whatever thoughts might suggest themselves to the mind—even if unhallowed the devotee was not to dismiss them, for the Lord sent them to purify the soul, if the will did not consent to them.[4] The two schools were at this time

[1] Böhmer, Francisca Hernandez, pp. 153–68.

[2] In the trial of Ortiz there was hearsay evidence (Ib. p. 28) that he had said that Francisca Hernandez had reached such a stage of perfection that chastity was unnecessary to her, but the Inquisition seems to have attached no weight to this.

[3] Böhmer, p. 174.

[4] Böhmer, pp. 17, 20.

known as those of Guadalajara and Pastrana, the former being *recojidos* and the latter *dejados*.[1] The quietism attributed to Molinos may be assumed to have found its origin in the *dejados*.[2]

About this time the Inquisitor General Manrique issued orders to the inquisitors to add to the annual Edict of Faith or of Denunciation whatever they thought best suited to lead to the detection of the Alumbrados.[3] This shows that as yet there was no generally accepted catalogue of errors and practices attributed to them. When in 1568 the Edict assumed the perfected form which it long retained, there was a section devoted to the Alumbrados which was modified from time to time as new tenets were attributed to them. From its final shape we learn that they were considered to teach that mental prayer is of divine command and accomplishes all that is requisite; that prayer is a sacrament hidden under the accidents; that mental prayer alone is of value, while oral prayer is unimportant; that the servants of God are not required to work or to perform manual labor, or to obey their superiors in anything that may interfere with mental prayer and contemplation; that they speak ill of the sacrament of matrimony; that no one can attain virtue save their own disciples; that no one can be saved without using their form of prayer and confessing to them; that certain ardors and tremblings and faintings which they suffer are signs of God's love, by which they know themselves to be in a state of grace and to possess the Holy Ghost; that the perfected have no need to perform virtuous works; that on reaching a certain stage of

[1] Melgares Marin, II. 53.

[2] This question as to evil thoughts assumed an immense importance in the condemnation of Molinos. It was a doctrine handed down from the earlier mystics that such thoughts were a means of lifting the soul to God. Henry Suso says: "Quoties pie Domine teter hic spiritus aut alii quivis ex eorum numero ejusmodi nefarias ac execrandas cogitationes mihi invito insusuraverint, toties deliberato animo jucundissima ac flagrantissima tibi ex me loco illorum laus exhibita sit in ævum sempiternum."—Susonis Dialogi cap. xxv. (Opp. Colon. Agripp. 1588, p. 158).

[3] Llorente, Hist. Critique, II. 3.

perfection the Divine Essence and the mysteries of the Trinity can be seen; that the Holy Ghost directly governs those who live in this fashion, and that this interior inspiration is to be followed in all things; that the worshipper is to close his eyes at the elevation of the host; that the perfected ought not to look at holy images or to listen to sermons.[1]

[1] The French version in Llorente (Hist. Critique, II. 3) is carelessly rendered, and the date is given as 1558. The Spanish edition (III. 156) of his book is more correct. Paramo (De Orig. Officii S. Inquis. pp. 626–7) gives a Latin version, showing that the same form was used at least to the close of the century.

The earliest version of the Edict with which I have met is an original issued in Mexico, July 17, 1579, which I owe to the kindness of General Riva Palacio. This differs so greatly from the later recensions that I copy the portion devoted to the alumbrados. The whole edict is much more crude in form and lacks the arrangement of the subsequent ones.

"O si sabeis que algunas personas vivas ó difuntas ayan dicho y afirmado que sola la oracion mental esta en precepto divino y con ella se cumple con todo lo demas, y que la oracion bocal ymporta muy poco, y que los sierbos de dios no an de travajar ni ocuparse en exercicios corporales, y que no se a de obedecer á perlado ni á padre ni superior en quanto mandaren cosa que estorve las oras de sú oracion mental y contemplacion, ó que ayan dicho palabras sintiendo mal del sacramento del matrimonio, y que los perfectos no tienen necesidad de hazer obras virtuosas, ó que alguna ó algunas personas ayan aconsejado generalmente á otras que hagan votos de no se casar, persuadiendoles que no entren en religion, sintiendo mal de las religiones, ó diziendo que las siervas de dios an de resplandecer viviendo en el siglo fuera de religion, ó que algunas personas ayan pedido á otras la obediencia y aviendosela dado ayan mandado á las personas que la dieron que no hagan cosa alguna aunque sea obra pia y virtuosa y de precepto sin su licencia y mandado, y que algunas personas ayan dicho y afirmado que aviendo llegado á cierto punto de perfeccion no pueden ver ymagines santas ni oir sermones ni la palabra de dios, ó que algunas personas ayan enseñado la dicha mala doctrina ó parte della encomendando el secreto."

This form must have been modified soon afterwards. A copy of the edict used in Mexico in 1588 (MSS. of David Fergusson, Esq.), one in Sardinia, without date (MSS. of Royal Library of Copenhagen, No. 214 fol.) and a printed copy in the Bodleian Library (Arch Seld. A. Subt. 15) are all substantially in accord with each other, and agree nearly with the Spanish version of Llorente, though the language of the latter has apparently been revised to render it more elegant. The only difference in sense of any importance is in the clause concerning the guidance of the Holy Ghost, which in the MSS. is

In this enumeration of Alumbrado errors it is observable that there is no direct allusion to the doctrine of impeccability which was the most serious charge brought against Illuminism, or to the indecency and licentiousness which subsequently became the chief object of inquisitorial investigation in these cases. It is further noteworthy that much is included which was inseparable from orthodox mysticism, and that nearly all is at worst only an exaggeration of what had long been accepted as essential in mystical theology. Thus the demarcation between sanctity and heresy was left as obscure as ever, and all who sought to attain salvation through the raptures of the prayer of Union were placed within the grasp of the Inquisition. It remains for us to see what use the Holy Office made of the opportunities thus afforded.

PERSECUTION.

The earliest development of mysticism to attract animadversion appears to have been in the region lying to the east of Madrid. We have seen how Antonio of Pastrana disciplined the eccentricities of a contemplative *fraile* of Ocaña, and that the Inquisition recognized two schools of mystics as those of Pastrana and Guadalajara. Pastrana in fact was a mystic centre. Many of the mystics were *conversos* or New Christians, and Pastrana was a spot where hidden Judaism long continued to exist. In the great *auto de fé* of Madrid in 1680 no less than sixteen of those condemned for secret Jewish practices were natives or residents of Pastrana.[1] Ci-

more absolute—"y que el spirito santo immediatamente gobierna a los que assi biben, y que solamente se ha de seguir su movimiento y inspiracion interior para hazer o dexar de hazer qualquier cossa."

[1] Olmo, Relacion Historico del Auto general de Fe que se celebro en Madrid en presencia de sus Magestades el dia 30 de Junio de 1680, Madrid, 1680. For details as to the mystics of Pastrana and its neighborhood see Böhmer, Francisca Hernandez, pp. 17 *sqq*.

fuentes, not far to the northeast, was another centre, while a little to the west lay Alcalá de Henares with its university. In all these places we hear of so-called Alumbrados, mostly Franciscan, for the Seraphic Order naturally attracted the souls inclined to mystic contemplation, but one of the most prominent was Pedro Ruiz Alcaráz, a married layman. Chief among the most extreme of the visionaries was Isabel de la Cruz, a woman who earned her livelihood by teaching embroidery, and whose eloquence in the exposition of Scripture was remarkable.[1] It was perhaps natural that the impressionable female nervous system should render women especially liable to the ecstasies which were the characteristic feature of this emotional form of religion; we find them everywhere as its exponents and missionaries and as the object of the profoundest veneration of their disciples. Even the mystically inclined Carranza complains of the multitude of female expounders in Spain and quotes St. Paul's prohibition.[2]

The propaganda of these enthusiasts seems to have been carried on for some years without concealment. The earliest reference to a date in accessible documents is to a conversation occurring in 1517 concerning Alcaráz and Isabel. The development of Lutheranism probably directed attention to the potential danger involved in their unchecked zeal, and in 1525 there is an allusion to "*la cuestion y suceso de los alumbrados*" as having occurred three or four years before, which would seem to place in 1521 or 1522 the first movement of the Inquisition against them.[3] In 1524 the prevalence of mystic practices among the Franciscans of the province of Toledo attracted attention; the provincial himself, Juan de Olmillos, was given to ecstasies and inspiration.[4] The general of the Order, Francisco de Quiñones, was making a visitation of Spain, and on May 22 he held a provincial chapter

[1] Melgares Marin, II. 31, 53, 107.
[2] Comentarios, Prologo al Lector.
[3] Melgares Marin, II. 6, 9.
[4] Böhmer, Francisca Hernandez, p. 59.

in Toledo where he threatened imprisonment for all who persisted in walking in the path of Illumination.[1] Persecution however did not fairly begin until the end of that year or the beginning of 1525, when there were a number of arrests, including Isabel and Alcaráz. The inquisitorial process rarely was speedy and it was not until 1529 that the culprits appeared in the *auto de fé* of Toledo. There were quite a number of them; Isabel and Alcaráz were condemned to imprisonment for life, and other penalties, including banishment and scourging, were freely administered.[2] Apparently none of them were burnt, which would indicate that all confes ed, recanted, and sought reconciliation with the Church.[3]

Among those arrested in 1525 was María Cazalla, sister of Bishop Cazalla, a man much respected for learning and eloquence, addicted to mysticism, and with a keen perception of the existing imperfections of the Church. Maria had been at Pastrana where she attended the meetings of the mystics and occasionally expounded Scripture. She was a wife and mother, evidently a clear-visioned woman who recognized the emptiness of mere outward formalities and yearned

1 Wadding, Annal. Minor. ann. 1524, No. 22.

2 Melgares Marin, II. 87.

3 Menendez y Pelayo, II. 526-8.—Melgares Marin, II. 87.

Menendez-y Pelayo gives from a MS. chronicle of Alonzo de Santa Cruz a statement of the errors of the penitents in this *auto* which if correct would show that they had carried Illuminism to its farthest extent. It is stated that they held that by mental prayer or *dejamiento* man could attain perfection and become absolutely sinless; that he was released from all obedience except to God, to whom he had given himself; that all exterior acts of worship and pious works were useless; that they called the Eucharist a lump of dough, the cross a stick and kneeling idolatry; in their ecstasies they drove away good thoughts and welcomed evil ones; oaths were unlawful and the petitions of the Lord's Prayer were selfish; the existence of hell was denied; they conversed with God as familiarly as with men; the marital act they called *Union con Dios.*

All this evidently only reflects popular gossip, as collected by a credulous chronicler. Had such beliefs existed among the *Alumbrados* other evidence would have reached us, and they would have found a place in the Edicts of Denunciation.

for something loftier than she could find in the routine of the ecclesiastical system, without having formulated any distinct theories for herself. At one time she had been closely associated with Isabel de la Cruz and had employed her to teach her daughters embroidery, but had quarrelled with her in 1522 and had seen no more of her. There was considerable evidence against María, but for some reason she was discharged.[1] The case rested for six years, but meanwhile, as the trials went on, fresh testimony accumulated. The beatific intercourse of the mystics with God does not seem to have elevated them above human infirmities, and there were numerous spiteful quarrels among them which found vent in serious accusations. Diego Hernandez, a priest who had been María's confessor, whom she had dismissed for seducing a nun and claiming that it was no sin, and who was now on trial for Illuminism, represented her as being in full accord with Isabel de la Cruz.[2] Then Francisca Hernandez, a *beata* of Valladolid, of whom we shall hear more hereafter, was now also on trial, on similar charges. They had been friends, but María had broken with her on account of her unrestricted intercourse with men, and Francisca now took her revenge by characterizing both María and her brother the bishop as fully imbued with all the errors of Illuminism; the bishop had said that his sister was the *maestra* of the Alumbrados of Pastrana and Guadalajara; a volume of her letters which was circulated among the elect was full of *cosas de Alumbrados*. Then also there was an old *beata* named Mari-Nunez, also a prisoner, who twenty years before had been ejected from his house by Lope de Rueda, María's husband, and who testified that Maria had exalted Isabel de la Cruz over St. Paul and all the saints; unluckily for her, when called upon to ratify her testimony, she said it was Alcaráz and not María who had thus praised Isabel, so she was promptly tortured until she returned to her first assertion and declared in addition that

[1] Melgares Marin, II. 6–15.

[2] Ibid. pp. 31, 35.

María was a worse heretic than either Isabel or Alcaráz.[1] In April, 1532, therefore María was again arrested and confined in the *carceles secretas* of the Inquisition; her brother the bishop would doubtless also have been prosecuted had he not opportunely died before 1530. Her trial dragged on until the end of 1533. The evidence against her was strong but she diminished its force by proving enmity on the part of the principal witnesses, whose identity she was fortunately able to guess, and she persistently and dauntlessly refused to confess. As a rule, confession was requisite to conviction, and the inquisitors necessarily had recourse to the universal solvent of all doubts—torture. She was cruelly tortured with two *jarras de agua*, without overcoming her resolution. According to the jurisprudence of the time this purged the adverse evidence, but the Inquisition was not in the habit of letting the people know of its failures. It simply declared that the prosecution had not proved its case, and, with its customary logic, condemned María to a fine and a public act of penitence for a crime of which she had not been convicted, and to abjure the heresy which she had not been proved to entertain.[2]

The persecution spread extensively, for each prisoner was compelled to name all whom he knew or supposed to be infected with alumbrado errors, and the circle was constantly increasing. It bore hard upon the Erasmists, although it seems absurd to associate the name of the worldly-wise keen-witted scholar of Rotterdam with mysticism—the connecting link apparently being a profound contempt for the perfunctory external manifestations which passed current as works of piety. Francisca Hernandez seems to have been specially conspicuous in thus compromising her friends. María Cazalla was an Erasmist, as well as her brother the bishop, and there was another brother, Pedro Cazalla, whom Francisca also accused. The learned Erasmist scholar, Juan de Vergara, one of the foremost names in Spanish contemporary letters,

[1] Melgares Marin, II. 12–13, 94–6, 106–8, 120–22, 134, 136–8.

[2] Ibid. pp. 142–54.

was another one of her victims who was arrested and tried.[1] One of her special intimates was Bernardino de Tovar, a pronounced Erasmist, who was similarly seized and put on trial.[2] As the persecution spread, in 1534, the Venerable Juan de Ávila, known as the Apostle of Andalusia, was arrested and imprisoned. It would have gone hard with him but for the Inquisitor General Manrique who greatly admired him and whose inclination to mysticism we have seen. Through this influence he was liberated, and his temper was shown in his remark that his incarceration was most fortunate as it had taught him more than all his previous years of study. Yet this acquittal and the subsequent effort to procure his canonization did not prevent his *Aviso y Reglas Christianas* from being condemned and placed on the Index.[3]

The general terror which these proceedings inspired, even in their earlier stages, among those who were sincerely desirous of leading a pious life without separating themselves from orthodoxy, is reflected by Juan de Valdés, in his *Diálogo de Mercurio y Caron*, where Mercury says that when anyone endeavors to manifest the perfection of Christianity he is persecuted, his words are misinterpreted, he is accused of saying what he never thought, and is condemned as a heretic, so that there is scarce anyone who dares to live as a true Christian.[4] María Cazalla took the same ground in her defence

[1] Melgares Marin, II. 154–55.

[2] Ibid. pp. 54, 107.—Erasmi Epistt. Auctar. ex Ludovico Vive Ep. 22 (Ed. 1642, p. 114).

When Tovar was arrested he was found in possession of Lutheran books, which told heavily against him (Melgares Marin, II. 54).

[3] Menendez y Pelayo, II. 532.—Llorente, II. 7.—Reusch, Der Index, I. 590.—Reusch, Die Indices, p. 232. After his death in 1569 an amended edition of his book appeared and was permitted (Ib. p. 432).

Juan's active life as a preacher ought to have saved him from the imputation of exaggerated mysticism. His advice to Pedro Guerrero, the Archbishop-elect of Granada, is thoroughly practical, and we find him urging a liberal distribution among the people of rosaries, crucifixes and images of the Virgin. —Ochoa, Epistolario Español, T. I. pp. 295–7 (Madrid, 1872).

[4] Diálogo de Mercurio y Caron, cap. lxv.—Juan de Valdés was inclined to mysticism. He tells us that the saint should wholly renounce his will and

when she said that the report of her being an *Alumbrada* did not make her one, except in so far as that name was customarily applied to anyone who was more self-contained (*recojida*) than others, or who avoided intercourse with the vicious; it was natural that it should be blindly attributed to her as it was to those who were better and more virtuous than she.[1]

The accusation was one easy to bring. The Inquisition, by its atrocious system of encouraging secret denunciation and suppressing the names of the witnesses, stimulated envy and malignity to work their evil will. The assumption of superior sanctity by the mystics necessarily provoked enmity, especially in the forced intimacy of the cloisters; careless words uttered in the heat of discussion could be trea ured up and exaggerated, and the unlucky devotee who was striving to win salvation by St. Bonaventura's path of illumination found that his orthodoxy had become heresy. A chance allusion in 1532 to "*el libro y registro de los alumbrados*"

reason and abandon himself to the guidance of God. Yet he wholly rejects the theory of impeccability by showing, in the case of David and others, that God sometimes influences the will in wrath.—Ziento y diez Consideraciones, Cons. XXV. (Usóz y Rio, pp. 101–2).

Even while a student in Alcalá, Juan de Valdés wrote a little book entitled *Doctrina Cristiana* which excited much animadversion. Bernardino de Tovar scolded him for publishing it so hastily, without giving himself time for its revision. María Cazalla admitted that she was in the habit of reading it until she heard the Franciscan, Pedro de Vitoria, preach against it, when she forbade her daughters to read it and threw it into the bottom of a chest until the Inquisition should decide about it. In her sentence one of the criminating facts is that "alababa mucho el librillo llamado Doctrina cristiana, habiendo en el como hay errores contra nuestra fe" (Melgares Marin, II. 55, 150). No such book is to be found in the Indexes of Valdés (1559), of Quiroga (1583), nor is it enumerated in any of the lists of the works of Juan de Valdés. He evidently never acknowledged it and it has disappeared from sight. Its existence thus made known is important as showing Juan de Valdés' early tendency to independence. Prof. Böhmer's suggestion (Francisca Hernandez, p. 24) that it was a Spanish version of the Enchiridion of Erasmus is clearly incompatible with the evidence now furnished by María Cazalla's trial. Besides, she quotes the Spanish Enchiridion by name (Melgares Marin, II. 125).

[1] Melgares Marin, II. 120. Cf. pp. 122, 123.

shows that by this time the prosecutions had become sufficiently numerous to require separate classification in the inquisitorial archives.[1] The trouble was not confined to the province of Toledo but spread throughout Spain. In 1533, from distant Aragon, a letter from Miguel de Galba, promotor fiscal in the diocese of Lérida, to the Inquisitor General Manrique, assures him that only steady repression exercised by the Holy Office prevents both kingdoms from being filled with the heresies of the accursed Martin Luther and of those who are known as illuminati but ought rather to be called blind.[2] So sensitive had the authorities become that any enthusiasm outside of the boundaries of rigid routine was regarded with suspicion. In 1527, when Ignatius Loyola, in the flush of his early zeal, endeavored to call sinners to repentance, he was arrested and imprisoned at Alcalá and again in Salamanca. Fortunately for him this was by the episcopal authorities and not by the Inquisition, and his incarceration in both cases was short, though he was forbidden to discriminate between venial and mortal sins until he should have studied theology for four years, whereupon he betook himself to the Sorbonne.[3]

[1] Melgares Marin, II. 17.

[2] "Para que publicamente se predicassen y guardassen las hereticas, erroneas, y falsas doctrinas y opinyones del heretico maldito martin luthero y de los llamados alumbrados que mas verdaderamente son dichos ciegos." (From the original in my possession.)

In 1557 the Venetian envoy, Federigo Badoero, speaks of Illuminism existing in Aragon: "In Aragona è entrata l' eresia degl' Illuminati" (Relazioni degli Ambasciatori Veneti, Serie I. T. III. p. 257). But if they were numerous there they had not the spirit of martyrdom, for there are none in the list of the victims burnt by the Inquisition of Saragossa from the beginning up to 1574 (Libro Verde de Aragon, Revista de España, Tom. CVI. pp. 570–83).

[3] Ribadeneira Vit. Ign. Loyolæ, Lib. I. cap. xiv. xv.—Ochoa, Epistolario Español, Madrid, 1870, T. II. p. 103.—It did not take long for the legend of St. Ignatius to outgrow the prosaic details of his life. In 1645 Nieremberg tells us (Honor del Gran Patriarcho San Ignacio, p. 12) that within the first year of his conversion in 1521 he suddenly received such illumination from

One of the most instructive cases in this persecution is that which brings together the names of Francisca Hernandez and Francisco Ortiz—a trial which Professor Eduard Böhmer has with infinite labor brought into intelligible form and printed with abundant illustrations from other sources. Francisca, though called a *beata*, was a curiously individual product of the spiritual excitement then pervading certain classes in Spain. She belonged to no religious order, she wore the secular dress of a lady of gentle birth, she was unmarried and owned no property, but she lived with two maids in Valladolid in a house belonging to the Cazallas, apparently supported in comfort by her disciples. Though she claimed to be the bride of Christ, she practised none of the austerities commonly deemed requisite to piety; her house was largely frequented by her male devotees, she slept on a soft bed and was fastidious in her diet—in proof of which it is on record that she once boxed her maid's ears for spoiling a blancmange. Yet the veneration which she excited in a circle comprising some of the best intellects in Spain was extraordinary. Bernardino de Tovar was one of them, and so was Francisco de Osuna, who forms a connecting link between Francisca and Santa Teresa de Jesus, for his *Abecedario* was the guide which

God that he at once was familiar with all the mysteries of the faith and the subtleties of philosophy.

Loyola had a tendency to mysticism, though his shrewd penetration led him to distrust the claims of the *beatas*, as we shall see in the case of Magdalena de la Cruz. When in Rome, in 1553, the Dominican Rainaldo discoursed to him of a holy virgin in a convent under his charge at Bologna, who had ecstasies in which she was insensible to fire and pricking; she could be aroused only by a single voice, when she arose as from sleep and commenced praying; her conception of the Passion was so strong that at times she had the Stigmata, which dropped blood. Subsequently Ribadeneira asked Loyola what he thought of it, when he replied that God could sanctify the souls of men and fill them with his gifts; sometimes he does this so copiously that the plenitude of his grace, overflowing the soul, appears in the body and gives manifestations of what is within, but this is very rare, and the Demon often deludes mortals greedy of vanity and novelty by fictitious images of things.—Ribadeneira, Lib. v. c. x.

led the latter to her heights of spiritual perfection.[1] Francisca was credited with the power of working miracles. She was said to have been a servant of God from childhood and never to have committed a mortal sin. She had never learned to read, yet she could tell the contents of a letter without opening it; without having been taught Latin her expositions of Holy Writ filled with rapture the best preachers of Spain. A piece of cloth or a string given by her would cure disease; indeed, as Ortiz declared before the Inquisition, it cost her but a single word to heal the sick.[2] Repeatedly she appeared to her disciples in visions, resplendent with divine glory. Yet Alcaráz declared when on trial that she was completely under the influence of Bishop Cazalla.[3]

She seems to have been already well known in 1517, at which time Ortiz said that he had vainly sought to make her acquaintance. Soon after this she was in trouble with the Inquisition and was brought before Cardinal Adrian, then inquisitor general. Though not punished she was not fully discharged but was kept under surveillance, in spite of which she made such an impression on Adrian that after he became pope, in 1522, he ordered his confessor Carmona to write to her, asking her prayers for him and for the whole church. Again

[1] Alban Butler, Vies des Saints, Ed. 1836, T. VII. p. 508. Yet I cannot help thinking that Osuna was disenchanted of Francisca as early as 1527 and that he had Ortiz in mind when, in describing the wiles of the demon to lead the devotee astray, he wrote: "Trouble not yourself about the advisers whom you cannot have. Those of your convent should suffice without running after little women (*mugercillas*) who are perhaps themselves deceived. Even if they are not, consider that the counsel of your superior is of more weight, for he can resolve your doubts and not those women whom you seek. When your spirit will subject itself only to this or that person who are reputed to be holy and to no others, think yourself deceived and that the Demon has persuaded you that you are something special, when in truth your fancy has deceived you into making an idol of yourself."—Abecedario, P. III. Trat. xx cap. vi. fol. 193*a*.

[2] Böhmer, Francisca Hernandez, pp. 25-7, 32, 70, 102, 105-7, 134, 138, 153, 161.

[3] Melgares Marin, II. 10.

in 1525, we hear of her being in the hands of the Inquisition, for she is described in a document of that year as "*beata*, prisoner in the inquisitorial prison." This time she seems to have been accused of improper relations with men and on her discharge she was made to swear that she would permit no improper familiarities. She was good-looking and attractive; she was not particularly reserved in her manners, and the suspicion not unnaturally continued that her relations with her disciples were carnal as well as spiritual. When Ortiz pleaded with the Inquisitor General Manrique to avert her arrest, the significant reply was "We know these lascivious persons."[1]

It is quite probable however that she might have been left undisturbed but for the fascination which she exercised over Ortiz. He was a young Franciscan of the greatest promise, to whom the Order looked for an increase of its influence and prestige. Though not precisely a mystic, he had a soul of exquisite sensibility and burning ardor, and his sermons, directed principally to developing the love of God, caused him to be at length reproved for preaching *alumbramientos*. When but nineteen years of age he had sought to make the acquaintance of Francisca, but the wish was not gratified till six years later, in 1523. He was then twenty-five and was rapidly acquiring the reputation of the foremost preacher in Spain.[2] In 1524 he was selected to preach the Lenten sermons before the court in Búrgos, where he excited the

[1] Böhmer, pp. 65, 102, 112, 113, 115, 120.—Melgares Marin, II. 12.

[2] Francisco Gonzaga, who was general of the Order, in his "De Origine Seraphicæ Religionis" (1587) describes Ortiz as "concionatorum sui temporis facile princeps quamobrem eorum monarcha ab omnibus communi titulo apellitabatur" (Böhmer, p. 224). This was doubtless the customary title bestowed upon him. The title-page of his posthumous *De Ornatu Animæ* (1548) characterizes him as "Omnium Prædicantium facile suo tempore Monarcha." According to Azpilcueta, however, his pre-eminence was disputed by Fray Luis de Granada, who was "omnium qui sua ætate in Hispaniis concionati sunt aut primus aut cum primis mea sententia censendus" (Enchiridion de Oratione, Romæ, 1578, p. 16).

greatest enthusiasm; men would go to the church over night in order to secure places, and on Low Sunday, April 3, he preached at the special request of Charles V. Yet some of his utterances caused murmuring, especially the assertion that Christ was in the hearts of the righteous more perfectly than in the Eucharist. In spite of this his reputation grew. It was probably in 1526 that Charles offered him the envied position of court preacher; he wrote to Francisca for advice, and on her telling him not to accept he refused.[1] Her influence over him had become absolute and his reverence for her boundless. Yet their intercourse had been restricted, for, as a friar, he could not visit her without permission from the guardian of his convent, and at one period several years elapsed between their meetings. Their intimacy excited animadversion and increasing efforts were made to prevent it. Fray Guinea, the guardian of the Franciscan convent at Valladolid repeatedly urged the inquisitor general to allow him to suppress the enthusiasm excited by Francisca. Manrique thought of putting her into the convent of Santa Isabel, but the nuns objected to being disturbed by so unquiet an inmate, and the employment of force would have caused scandal. Finally Francisca left Valladolid for Castillo Tejeriego, about twenty miles distant, where she was the guest of the wife of the commandant, Don Bernardino. Ortiz, unable to endure the separation longer, went there in May, 1528, with Fray Muñatello, a fellow disciple, and remained until July.[2]

[1] Böhmer, pp. 31, 42, 65.

[2] Böhmer, pp. 47–8, 52.—A letter of Ortiz to Francisca, written shortly after this and produced during his trial, commences "O my lady! O my purest love! O my blessed inwardness and light of my soul and my heart and my eyes!" He asks among other things that she restore sight to his blind mother, for she has only to will it, and he signs himself "the little son and servant of your great grace, who desires to kiss your holy feet with the greatest reverence" (Ib. p. 75).

This worship of a human being by a man of unusual intellectual power is a curious illustration of the morbid spirituality of the period. It is impossible

This imprudent visit brought matters to a crisis. On the one hand the Inquisition commenced forthwith again to take testimony against Francisca. On the other, the Franciscans made such a stir over it that at the chapter held at Guadalajara, October 1528, the vicar general sent a letter summarily ordering Ortiz no more to see or to write to Francisca. To this Ortiz replied defiantly that God was to be obeyed rather than man; if he knew that by remaining in the Order he was to be debarred from seeing that beloved one of God, he would become a Carthusian—for it was always open to a member of an Order to transfer himself to one of stricter observance. Ortiz was then in the convent of San Juan de los Reyes of Toledo; the guardian, Fray Bernabé, did not forward the letter, for the Franciscans did not wish to lose so distinguished a preacher, and it seemed more worldly-wise to urge forward the proceedings against Francisca, whose arrest it was hoped would disenchant him, when as a good Christian he would submit. About Christmas, 1528, Bernabé arranged with the inquisitor general that the arrest should be made after Easter 1529, in order not to interfere with the Lenten sermons which Ortiz was to preach. The secret was not well kept, and it reached his ears. Twice he visited Cardinal Manrique to remonstrate, and the second time he was told that he had best take heed for himself, as his guardian would have imprisoned him but for needing his services as a preacher.[1]

The plan was carried out. Francisca was arrested and brought to Toledo, arriving on the evening of Easter Monday, March 30, and was taken, not to the Inquisition but to a private house. There Ortiz saw her on Tuesday, but when Bernabé heard of the interview the next day he procured her transfer to the *carceles secretas* of the Inquisition. Ortiz speedily came to the desperate resolution of publicly rebuking

however not to recognize in it the sexual influence, however little Ortiz himself may have suspected it.

[1] Böhmer, pp. 58–60, 62, 65.

the inquisitor general; he argued to himself that he had given the latter two admonitions in private, and that it was his duty now to reprehend him in public. He was assigned to preach on April 6, which would afford him the opportunity, and he awaited it with such inexpressible eagerness that he could scarce eat or sleep. The intervening days, he afterwards said, seemed to him longer than his whole previous life, while for fear of being prevented he was obliged to preserve perfect outward calmness. The day came at last. The Franciscan church was filled with the magnates and officials of the city, besides the brethren of the convent. Ortiz mounted the pulpit and announced his theme as the obedience due to God rather than to man. After a brief introduction he broke forth, saying that he was not a prophet or the son of a prophet and could not foretell whether God would inflict condign chastisement for a great sin recently committed in the city—the imprisonment of Francisca Hernandez. The friars interrupted him, but he imposed silence on them and proceeded to tell how he had visited Cardinal Manrique and had been received like an angel; how he had gone to him again and found that the Guardian Bernabé had poisoned his mind. By this time Bernabé and his brethren had recovered themselves. They rushed to the pulpit and after a short struggle pulled Ortiz down; to free the church from the pollution of his presence he was dragged to a neighboring house where he lay till evening without food. Then Bernabé came and announced that he was to be taken to the Inquisition; Ortiz thanked him for the joyful news and hurried off, delighted to think that he was to be under the same roof as his beloved Francisca.[1]

His insane freak had caused the wildest excitement. To beard publicly the terrible Holy Office was an offence so unexampled that it was difficult of credence. Men naturally argued that a belief ardent enough to lead to extravagance so

[1] Böhmer, pp. 73–80.

reckless must have within it the possibilities of most dangerous development and thanked God that Francisca, who was the mother and source of the new sect, had been imprisoned, as it would strike terror among the disciples. Meanwhile Ortiz, with feverish ardor unabated, was bombarding Cardinal Manrique and the inquisitors with letters in which he assured them that Francisca's imprisonment would arouse a great portion of Christendom. His own, he said, would resound in Portugal and France and Italy where he was well known, but what concerned him most was that it would resound in Paradise. He even threatened them with the opposition of a new and holy society, a society founded for the honor of God and his truth. So long as he has the grace of God, seven thousand years' imprisonment is nothing to him, for it is a holy confinement and brings him peace. To the reproach of undue affection for Francisca he replied "No word of love, however strong, is a hundredth part adequate to express the holy love, so pure and sweet and strong and great and full of God's blessing and melting of heart and soul, which God in his goodness has given me through his holy betrothed, my true Mother and Lady, through whom I hope, at the awful day of judgment, to be reckoned among the elect. I can call her my love, for in loving her I love nothing but God, and her grace, coöperating with God, makes me see the nothingness of this world." As for his sermon, he would not retract it, even to save Francisca from a thousand deaths, for to do so would be to deny God, and he suggested that Cardinal Manrique could readily purge himself of his wrong-doing by releasing Francisca with public announcement that there was no proof against her, by replacing him (Ortiz) in his functions, and by suppressing his persecutors.[1] The inquisitors might well deem him a monomaniac.

It is not necessary to follow in detail the course of the trial. In his voluminous communications the defiant Ortiz said

[1] Böhmer, pp. 83, 91, 95, 97, 101–2, 109, 110.

quite enough to compromise both of them as to the burning question of good works. Francisca had taught him, he said, to set little store by externals. In case of necessity he would eat meat even on Good Friday. Marriage might be a duty even to those under vows of continence, but they must have a dispensation from the pope, who would sin if he refused it. He argued at considerable length the unimportance of external observances and instanced the Jewish law which had ceased to be binding. He pointed out the varying customs of the Church at different times and argued that the one thing necessary is the love of God, whether one fasts or feasts, laughs or weeps, speaks or keeps silent. He declared that God will not suffer those who seek him with a pure heart to err in things necessary to salvation, which was erecting the standard of private judgment and making divine guidance superior to the mandates of the Church, especially as he applied it to himself to prove that he was justified in his course.[1] At the same time his denunciation of the *pestilenzias de alumbrados* shows that the doctrines of the mystics most dangerous to the established order of the Church were spreading among a class wholly averse to the follies of Illuminism. It is true that he held mental prayer to be better than vocal, but the latter was not unnecessary, and he reduced *recojimiento* to a banishment of thought in order to become conscious of the invisible, while he ridiculed the ecstasies and trances and visions and revelations forming the stock in trade of the mystics who claimed to be specially favored of God.[2]

We have no details of the trial of Francisca. We only know from the evidence in that of María Cazalla that she was a swift witness against her former associates, and that she seems to have won the favor of the inquisitors, for in 1532 she is no longer in the *carceles secretas*, but is simply detained, with her maid María Ramirez to wait upon her, in the house of Gutierre Perez de Montalvo, at Medina del Campo, where,

[1] Böhmer, pp. 98–100, 123.

[2] Ibid. pp. 122, 133–4.

September 11, both women ratified their evidence against María Cazalla.[1] The firm convictions of Ortiz exposed him to more prolonged imprisonment, but even in his case the Inquisition seems to have treated him with remarkable leniency, considering the grave nature of his offence in holding it up to public reprobation from the pulpit. After he had been in prison for about a month, Doctor Luis Coronel, Cardinal Manrique's secretary, was sent to his cell to endeavor to win him over to a retraction of his injurious expressions, but Ortiz could see nothing save the offence to God in Francisca's arrest.[2] He continued in the same mood, and though he formally submitted to the Church, he persisted in attributing to the grace of God the cheerfulness and serenity with which he endured his protracted incarceration. When more than two years had thus passed and he was told that this reasoning was illusory and arrogant, he suggested that the theologians who so characterized it should take his place for twenty-eight months and see how they liked it. He voluntarily subjected himself to additional austerities, eating no meat, sleeping on a plank and often giving his bread to the poor that they might pray for the prisoners.[3] He evidently was a puzzling subject, and the inquisitors wisely concluded to trust to the influence of time. It was in vain that the Empress Isabel, who was regent during the absence of Charles V., interposed her good offices in his favor during the summer of 1530, and again wrote urgently, October 27, expressing her desire for his liberation, or at least that his case should be expedited. She was about to send his younger brother, Doctor Pedro Ortiz, to Rome on the matter of the divorce of Catherine of Aragon, and it was not fitting that Francisco should be a prisoner of the Inquisition at the time.[4]

Even under this pressure the Inquisition was imperturbable. It was not until March 20, 1531, that the customary assembly

[1] Melgares Marin, II. 94–5.
[2] Böhmer, pp. 85–6.
[3] Böhmer, pp. 119, 124, 156.
[4] Ibid. p. 140.

of consulters was held to decide upon his case. They appointed three of their number to draw up the heretical and erroneous propositions which he should be called upon to retract. This work was not accomplished until July, when Ortiz showed himself in a more complying mood and promised to do so. When a copy of the sixty-three articles, however, was given to him, he only retracted a few; some he bluntly refused to withdraw and others he argued. He maintained all that was most offensive to the Inquisition and showed that his conviction of his own righteousness was unaltered. When unconditional submission was demanded he positively refused it. Then he was left severely alone in his solitude for six months, until, February 3, 1532, he asked an audience. His feelings had undergone a complete revolution, and the same impulsiveness which had led him to defy the Holy Office now prompted him to the humblest submission in the desire to renounce himself wholly in obedience to the will of God. He asked to be allowed to take back in the pulpit what he had uttered in the pulpit and in secret what he had said in secret. This was still insufficient. On April 17 he was brought before the tribunal and told that submission through humility and as a sacrifice to God would not answer. He must admit that he had erred; the affair was important and the honor of the Inquisition was at stake. To this Ortiz heartily assented. God, he said, had given him grace to recognize his errors and he found great peace in retracting them. He had imagined himself called by God to preach that sermon, but he now admitted his error and was ready for the recantation.[1] Nothing more could be asked, and his sentence followed. He was to march in procession with a lighted taper from the prison to the cathedral, where he was to abjure for vehement suspicion of heresy. For five years he was suspended from his priestly functions and for two years he was confined in a cell in the convent of Torre-

[1] Böhmer, pp. 148–73.

laguna, having no intercourse with his brethren; during this time he was to perform certain penances, which were kindly modified in consideration of his enfeebled health, and he was never to hold any intercourse, direct or indirect, with Francisca Hernandez, or to live within five leagues of her place of residence, under pain of the stake as a relapsed heretic.[1] That his submission was the work of self-conquest and of profound Christian humility is seen in a passage of a letter written by him from Torrelaguna—"Whoso brings me to the way of the saints does me the greatest benefit. Whoso persecutes, helps me to salvation. Whoso humiliates me favors me, though his aim may be to injure. What is done to insult or oppress me is an act of friendship."[2]

Though the term of his confinement ended April 21, 1534, though papal briefs were obtained relieving him from restrictions, though the Generals of the Order repeatedly urged him to leave his solitude and resume the functions which had promised so brilliantly, and though he had the most flattering invitations he would seem never afterwards to have set his foot outside of the convent of Torrelaguna. The retirement which had been prescribed to him as a penance, he said, had become too sweet for him to abandon it. There he lived, the object of overflowing honor on the part of his brethren inside and outside of the convent till his death in 1546.[3]

[1] Ibid. pp. 174–5.

[2] Ochoa, Epistolario Español, T. I. p. 261.

[3] Ochoa, I. 266, 269, 272, 287, 289.

The year after his death, in 1547, his brother, Juan Ortiz, printed his work *De Ornatu Animæ*, doubtless one of the products of his retreat. It is cast in a form suited to the fondness of the age for conceits. The soul is a bride arrayed for Christ, and in nineteen chapters he describes the garments and jewels requisite for its adornment. The chemise signifies faith, the tunic charity, the shoes contempt for the world, the net for the hair prudence, the cloak patience, the ear-rings obedience, the necklace remembrance of the bonds of Christ, the bracelets zeal for work, the crown humility, and so forth. It is observable that none of the vestments are identified with prayer, but he does not neglect to urge the supreme excellence of meditation, which was the initiatory grade of mental prayer among the extreme mystics. There are

I have dwelt at some length on this case because the completeness of its records render it especially instructive as to the spiritual movement then agitating so many pious souls in Spain, and also because it illustrates the extreme tenuity of the boundary line between heresy and orthodoxy in mysticism. From it, moreover, and from the trial of María Cazalla we see how the accusation of Illuminism was a most facile method of attacking anyone inclined to mystic dreams. This is a lesson still more sharply taught by one aspect of the celebrated trial of Bartolomé Carranza de Miranda, Archbishop of Toledo. Few men of the period had given more evidence of uncompromising devotion to the Church. Since early youth he had labored unsparingly in its interests while steadily declining its rewards. He had taught theology with distinguished success in the renowned university of Valladolid. At the first and second convocations of the Council of Trent he had been a foremost representative of Spanish faith. He had long served as a *calificador* of the Holy Office, especially in the matter of examining suspected books. He had accompanied Philip II. to England in 1554 and was the leading spirit in the Marian persecution, in forcing Cranmer to the stake, in exhuming the bones of Martin Bucer and of the wife of Peter Martyr of Vermigli, and in bringing about the restoration of Catholicism. Called to Flanders by Philip in

passages (fol. 16, 30) which show that he had not forgotten the raptures of mystic ardor, though in the main the work is not one of exalted fervor, but a learned treatise, filled with references to the Scriptures, the fathers, and the schoolmen. He teaches in it the same humility and yearning to suffer for Christ's sake that he himself felt.

A long letter of instruction, written in 1535, to a sister who had embraced a celibate life without entering a religious order, is silent on the subject of mental prayer. The first condition of earning salvation is amendment of life, after which come an earnest seeking for the love of God, humility and contempt for the world. He recommends many formal religious exercises, and while the whole is pervaded with mysticism there is no illuminism.—Ochoa, Epistolario, I. 251–60.

In another hortatory letter, written in 1536, he expressly says that faith is insufficient unless it shows itself in works.—Ib. p. 293.

1557 he showed himself equally zealous in stamping out heresy there, and when in that year Philip pressed upon him the fatal primacy of Toledo he thrice refused and only yielded in obedience to a peremptory royal order. So high was his reputation that his nomination was accepted by Paul IV. without the usual preliminary formalities of investigation. He returned to Spain, August 8, 1558, to take possession of his see, and found himself at once involved in a struggle with the Inquisition which cost him seventeen years of imprisonment and only ended with his condemnation and death.

It might have seemed impossible to accuse such a man of doctrinal errors, but unluckily, just before his return to Spain, he had published in 1558 his *Comentarios sobre el Catechismo*, in which he necessarily discussed nearly all the points of faith. He had made many enemies, for he was keenly alive to the shortcomings of the Church and outspoken in their denunciation. Some ten years before he had published a work on the personal residence required of bishops, which had given great offence.[1] His two most formidable antagonists now were the Inquisitor General Valdés, who had hoped for

[1] The Council of Trent in January, 1547, denounced the abuse of episcopal non-residence in the strongest terms, deploring that the ancient canons had fallen into virtual desuetude and providing sharp remedies to bring bishops to a sense of their duties (Concil. Trident. Sess. VI. De Reform. c. 1). The cardinals who, at the request of Pius III. in 1538, drew up the celebrated *Consilium de emendanda Ecclesia*, had already spoken of this in even more decided fashion: "Nam, per Deum immortalem, quis miserabilior viro Christiano conspectus esse potest Christianum orbem peragranti quam hæc solitudo ecclesiarum? Omnes fere pastores recesserunt a suis gregibus, commissi sunt omnes fere mercenariis" (Le Plat, Monumenta ad Hist. Conc. Trident. II. 600–1). With these precedents before him it is not likely that Carranza measured the words with which he sought to enforce the reform. I have not seen his tract, but it probably was as plain-spoken as the contemporary work on the same theme by the Doctor Girolamo Gigante, who does not hesitate to say of non-resident bishops "jam non amplius speculatores sed peculatores verius dixerim," and that they are not the vicars of Christ, but of Antichrist.—Hieron. Gigantis Tract de Residentia Episcoporum, Cap. I. No. 7; Cap. VI. No. 4 (Venet. 1548).

the archiepiscopal see of Toledo, and his fellow Dominican Melchor Cano, the foremost theologian of Spain, a man of keen intellect, boundless learning, and uncompromising temper. The *Comentarios* gave his enemies the wished-for opportunity of attack. The book at once was diligently scrutinized and there was little difficulty in finding in it a long list of errors. This is not the place to consider all the elements which combined to precipitate Carranza's downfall, or to follow the interminable details of his memorable trial. What interests us here is merely the question which was raised as to his being an Alumbrado.

His book is pervaded by a decided tendency to mysticism, and Melchor Cano had no difficulty in extracting from it passages by which he proved that Carranza held the Alumbrado doctrines of impeccability, of interior illumination by the Holy Ghost, of the supreme merits of a life of contemplation, and of despising all exterior works and observances.[1] Unfortunately for Carranza he was a confused thinker, with an intolerably diffuse style, involving endless repetitions and contradictions, in a class of subjects specially requiring clearness. Propositions are enunciated in general terms, to be subsequently qualified and limited. A man like Melchor Cano wanted nothing better than such a book from which to extract compromising passages and omit their limitations.

On the crucial point of the sufficing efficacy of mental

[1] Censura de los Maestros Fr. Melchor Cano y Fr. Domingo de Cuevas sobre los Comentarios y otros escritos de D. Fr. Bartolomé de Carranza (Caballero, Vida de Melchor Cano, pp. 549–50, 557–9, 568–9, 572–7, 582–3, 592–3, 598, 601).

In view of Melchor Cano's rabid hatred of mysticism, it is perhaps worth noting that he trained for a religious life the son of his cousin Ana Cano; the youth adopted the name of his distinguished kinsman, entered the Dominican Order and became one of the most prominent mystics of the day, earning the appellation of *El Extático* by his visions, trances and miracles. He died in 1607, and though he failed of canonization he is still venerated as a saint at Madrilejos, where he was prior of the convent of San Jacinto (Caballero, *op. cit.* pp. 209–13).

prayer, which was the distinguishing dogma of the advanced mystics, Carranza shows himself as orthodox as his slovenly habits of thought will permit. Mental prayer is superior, but vocal prayer is very useful, for the voice and movement of the body excite devotion whereby the heart is lifted to God. Still, if the voice distracts the mind it should be stopped. To be efficacious moreover prayer should be accompanied with fasting and thanksgiving. Church ceremonies and singing are very useful, but the words should be clearly uttered and the music should not obscure them—an abuse which is very common in the Church. To assert that the saints are not to be prayed to is not only heresy but ignorance and folly.[1] More perilous was the assumption that prayer is not the mere mechanical repetition of words, for God must be sought with a purified heart. Many there are who read prayers but who do not pray. It is the same with all other exterior manifestations of zeal, the value of which depends on the interior spirit.[2] Thoroughly orthodox, however, is his appreciation of the good works of mortification and charity. The soul is purer and freer the more the flesh is afflicted and subjected. By fasting we approach God and resist the devil; fasting converts men into angels, gives satisfaction for sins and earns eternal life in heaven. So almsgiving, taken in its widest sense, is a sacrifice offered to God, a work of penitence as affording satisfaction for sins. Prayer, fasting, and charity are works of satisfaction; but, as we have already seen, if performed without faith and love they are not pleasing to God, and the only efficient fasting is that which comprises abstinence from evil passions, so that both the interior and the exterior man participate in it.[3] Images and relics

[1] Comentarios, fol. 374, 375*a*, 376*a*, 379*a*.

[2] Comentarios, fol. 380. "De manera que la oracion vocal y los otros gestos y ceremonios que se hazen de fuera, como herir los pechos, y levantar los manos y los ojos al cielo, poner las rodillas en tierra, todos an de nacer del corazon."

[3] Ibid. fol. 418, 419, 420, 429*a*.

and pilgrimages, the rejection of which was a tenet attributed to the Alumbrados, he argued were aids to devotion and deserving of veneration, but he criticized the abuses which had arisen respecting them, through the negligence of prelates, with a freedom which gave great offence.[1] The sign of the cross, conjoined with faith, he tells us is the most efficacious means of putting the devil to flight. With it the Christian can defend himself against all enemies.[2] All this was directly antagonistic to the views of the advanced mystics, except in so far as he made the value of works dependent upon faith, and this limitation the Inquisition was not as yet prepared to condemn.

But Carranza gave a fair opening for attack, of which Melchor Cano did not neglect to avail himself, when he descanted upon the perpetual Sabbath of God. The distinction between holy days and working days is instituted for the rude and imperfect Christian; the spiritual and perfected man enjoys a perpetual Sabbath. It would not be easy to express the views of the Quietists more clearly than he does in a passage where he describes the supreme state of Quietism—the abandonment of the soul to God who operates it at his pleasure. External works have done their part and have been left behind, the devotee enjoys a perpetual spiritual Sabbath on earth which is but the commencement of the eternal Sabbath of heaven.[3] Man is perfected here and of course need

[1] Ibid. fol. 169–72.

[2] Ibid. fol. 163. "La señal de la cruz, acompañada con fe, es la cosa que mas huyen los diablos. . . . . Con este baculo de la cruz y con esta arma se defendera el hombre Christiano de todos sus enemigos. Esto con fe firma es un torre inexpugnable contra todo el poder del infierno."

[3] Ibid. fol. 207. "Assi nosotros despues que uvieremos trabajado en las obras exteriores y en la mortificacion de nuestra carne, dando obediencia à Dios, dexaremos de obrar nuestras obras y haremos holgança y sabado en Dios, dexando que su espiritu obre en nosotros y estando quietos y atentos à lo que Dios dixere en nosotros, y obedientes para recebir lo que su espiritu quisiere obrar, y obrando nosotros con el, no siguiendo nosotros afectos humanos sino sus sanctas inspiraciones. Este es el Sabado interior y espiritual

fear neither hell nor purgatory. From such premises it would not be difficult to draw the conclusion of impeccability—that the soul thus wholly under the direct influence of God can do no sin, while the self-deception of those who imagined themselves to have attained this supreme perfection might readily lead them to attribute to God the suggestions of their own passions. This Carranza seeks to elude by describing the perpetual Sabbath as an unremitting mortification of the flesh, a crucifying of all human passions and affections and a total renunciation of the things of this life.[1] Besides, even the perfect should observe the exterior Sabbath, in order to avoid scandal, although they have no need for it, for to them all days are the same.[2]

There was one unfortunate passage of which Melchor Cano made the most, as bearing upon the illuminist doctrine of impeccability—that if the reason is maintained at its due elevation and does not stoop to the level of the flesh, man may remain without sin although sensuality burns in his passions as in living flames. Molinos uttered nothing more reckless, especially as it was the culmination of an elaborate argument to prove that there is no sin in sensual and evil thoughts to which the will does not consent. Desire to commit sin is sin, even without the act, but mere sensual movements, natural to man since the Fall, are no sin if they are rejected by the will. Yet in this Carranza, no more than Molinos, meant to open the door to the insidious approaches of evil. It is the office of the reason (*apetito racional*), he continues, to govern the senses (*apetito sensitivo*). A man conceives sin when he takes pleasure in thinking of it; he

que nos enseña S. Pablo à hazer, no de ocho à ocho dias, como se haze el sabado ceremonial, sino toda la semana y todo el mes, y todo el año, y toda la vida. A este sabado sucede el otro Sabado perpetua que celebran los sanctos en el cielo."

[1] Comentarios, fol. 207–8.

[2] Ibid. fol. 208. In this, as well as in the interior illumination by the Holy Spirit, there is a curious anticipation of Quaker tenets.

brings it forth when he consents to it; but if his reason dissents there is no sin; and he concludes: "God desires in man not only pure words and works but above all a pure heart, and the heart is pure when it is purged of all worldly passions and affections and is filled with the love of God and of its neighbor."[1] Nothing, in fact, can be more opposed to the *dejamiento* or self-abandonment attributed to the Alumbrados and Quietists than the advice which he adds that the best way to extinguish the flames of passion is to pray to God with faith and fervor, for no water will subdue material fire so surely as will prayer the passions of the flesh.[2] If to this be added fasting we are armed from head to foot against the enemy.[3]

Another unlucky phrase seized upon by Melchor Cano was that living faith permits no evil works, which affirms impeccability. Yet this occurs in a description of two kinds of faith. One of these is dead—*fe informe* or *muerta*—which does not prevent a man from committing sin; he may have faith, even when in mortal sin, but the faith is not operative—"faith without works is dead" (James, ii. 20). The second is a faith which comprises all Christian virtues and their corresponding works; this is *fe formada y fe viva*, animated by the spirit of God which presides in the heart. This faith permits no evil works, but good works are its flower and harvest.[4] It was, after all, but a question of definition.

The most dangerous of his mystic speculations, however, was the power which he attributed to the internal illumination wrought by the Holy Ghost, and of this Melchor Cano did not hesitate to take full advantage. When the Holy Ghost enters the soul it is illuminated as to both natural and supernatural things so far as is necessary to salvation, and all the righteous are thus *alumbrados* to understand the secrets

[1] Çomentarios, fol. 277–8. "Si la razon se estuviesse en su grado y no se abatiesse à las baxesas de la carne quedaria el hombre en su honrra y sin pecado aunque ardiesse la sensualidad en sus passiones como en vivas llamas."
[2] Ibid. fol. 279*b*. [3] Ibid. fol. 280*a*. [4] Ibid. fol. 11.

of God and the mysteries of religion. Through natural theology we only reach a knowledge of God *a posteriori*, but this illumination enables us to know God directly, and from him we descend to a knowledge of his creatures. Thus the learning of theology, apart from this illumination, is vain, and so also is natural science, for the *alumbrado* understands nature better than Aristotle or Plato. Not only this, but the Holy Ghost gives the *don de consejo*—the prudence which guides us safely through the perils of life far better than human wisdom, and man has only to consult God in worldly matters as well as in those which pertain to salvation.[1] The

[1] "Sobreviene el Espiritu santo y cura esta flaqueza nuestra y con mayor lumbre alumbra nuestra alma para que podamos conocer mejor y con mas limpieza las cosas naturales y de las sobrenaturales alomenos todas las que fueren necessarias para nuestra salvacion. Hasta esto son alumbrados todos los justos y algunos para conocer cosas mayores de Dios y misterios secretos de nuestra religion, los quales descubre N. S. à quien le plaze."—Comentarios, fol. 118*a*.

"El don de la sciencia es otra lumbre que viene al entendimiento de la union del Espiritu santo con el alma donde el mora y de la union de nuestra voluntad (por medio de la charidad) con Dios. Por esta lumbre sabemos distinguir las cosas de la fe de las que no lo son. Por este don tenemos conocimiento en todas las cosas criadas mas claro y mas limpio que se tiene por ninguna sciencia natural. . . . . Los hombres justos disengañados de los errores y opiniones del mundo huyen el mal verdadero y no se espantan de la sombre y de la figura del."—Ib. fol. 121*a*.

"El don de consejo es otra lumbre con que el Espiritu santo alumbre nuestro entendimiento para escoger lo que devemos hazer en las cosas humanas y en todos los negocios que se ofrecen en la vida presente. . . . . Por esto es necessario para no errar y para asegurarnos en la vida que vivimos, tan llena de peligros y de tantas tinieblas, no fiarnos de nuestra prudencia, sino consultar à Dios para que nos alumbre en lo que devemos elegir en todos los negocios presentes, no solamente en los necessarios para encaminar bien nuestra vida à salvarnos, pero en los negocios humanos para acertar en ellos; no ay otra camina que cierta sea sino consultar à Dios que guie y alumbre nuestra razon."—Ibid. fol. 121*b*.

Even Jerónimo Gracian, the spiritual director of Santa Teresa, is equally emphatic in his assertion as to the knowledge of things terrestrial and divine which comes from this illumination of contemplation — Itinerario de la Perfeccion, cap. ix. §§ 1, 2.

extreme doctrines of illuminism could scarce be more resolutely affirmed. The mediatory powers of the Church were cast aside, as well as its authority to define the doctrines of faith and morals; man dealt directly with God, and his private judgment, divinely illuminated, was necessarily his tribunal of last resort. What became of the obedience due to the Church in all things when man had God for his monitor and guide? Yet Carranza, having thus precisely defined these dangerous doctrines proceeded, with customary inconsistency, to contradict himself. This gift of illumination is given to the Church at large with respect to matters requisite to salvation, to the righteous man only as regards the affairs of life. Besides, the illumination of the individual intellect is accompanied with other gifts: among these is the *espiritu de religion*, which teaches us how to venerate the saints and use their intercession, how to reverence and employ the sacraments, to respect holy places, to honor the Scriptures and know how far we can understand them, and in short to deal with all the affairs of religion ordained for the honor and service of God. Then there is the gift of fortitude, which enables us to persevere in good works. If he added the gift of faith which enables some of the elect to perform miracles, to cure the sick, to distinguish good spirits from the demons which transfigure themselves into angels of light, he only expressed a belief which the orthodox shared with the Alumbrados.[1] How far he was from assuming that the state of perfection carried with it assurance of impeccability is seen in his warning that the perfect must guard themselves from the presumption and self-confidence through which so many are lost, and that the fasting which is the commencement of spiritual life must be persevered in to preserve it.[2]

There is nothing in Molinos's *Guida Spirituale* half so dangerous as passages which have been cited above, and a

[1] Comentarios, fol. 121*b*, 122, 124*a*.

[2] Ibid. fol. 409*a*, 412*b*.

tithe of the ingenuity which was expended in deducing evil results from innocent premises in the case of Molinos would have consigned Carranza to an eternity of infamy. Yet the course which the affair took shows how at this period Spain was hypersensitive as to the dangers of mysticism while Rome for a century remained callous to them. Melchor Cano had no hesitation in asserting that Carranza defended the heresies of the Beghards and Beguines, of Pedro Ruiz Alcaráz and of the Alumbrados who had been punished by the Inquisition of Toledo.[1] On the other hand, in 1563, the Index Commission of the Council of Trent unanimously approved the *Comentarios* and declared that they contained no errors.[2] Some years later, moreover, St. Pius V. permitted the public sale of the work in Rome, and when the Spanish fiscal Salgado urged him to prohibit it he warned the Spaniards not to force him to approve it by a *motu proprio*.[3] When finally, in 1576, Spanish insistence procured from Gregory XIII. the condemnation of the work and of its author, of the sixteen propositions which he was required to abjure, only three had any relation to mysticism, and even these were rather Lutheran—that all works without charity are sins and offend God, that faith without works suffices for salvation, and that the use of images and the veneration of relics are of merely human precept.[4] The dangerous approximation to Illuminism and impeccability was passed over as unworthy of attention.

[1] Caballero, Vida de Melchor Cano, p. 550.

[2] Caballero, p. 327. Cf. Sarpi, Istoria del Concilio Tridentino, Lib. VIII. (Ed. Helmstadt. I. 346–7).

[3] A. de Castro, Protestantes Españoles, p. 227.

[4] Salazar de Mendoza, Vida de Carranza, cap. xxxiii. Of these three errors the first, which is the most nearly related to mysticism, had, as we have seen, the support of the great authority of Azpilcueta (ante, p. 241).

Even in Spain the *Comentarios* experienced vicissitudes difficult to explain. Valdés of course placed the work on the Index of 1559, but it was removed when that Index was issued by Philip II. at Antwerp in 1570, and it reappears in the Index of Quiroga in 1583 (Reusch, Die Indices, pp. 233, 434.—Index Libb. Prohibb. Antverpiæ, 1570, p. 98).

It was probably the warning conveyed in the case of Carranza rather than the thirst for solitude as stated in his biographies, which drove the Venerable Gregorio Lopez to the wilds of Mexico in 1562 at the age of twenty. Solitude he could have found in the sierras of his native land—in fact, at the age of ten he had escaped from his father's house and lived for six years with a hermit in the mountains of Navarre —but Mexico was attractive, for the Inquisition was not organized there until 1572, and for some time it was doubtless inefficient. Lopez had refused to enter the priesthood because the external works of the Church were a hindrance to his intercourse with God; he never went to confession or used a rosary. The only book he carried with him was the Bible and the only name on which he relied was that of Christ. For three years he repeated without intermission "Thy will be done in time and in eternity," and for the thirty-six years of remaining life he continued the practice internally without uttering a syllable. He was an ideal Quietist, and as such earned the admiration of Molinos, who reverently exclaims "O incarnate seraph! O divine man!" As the Inquisition extended its organization throughout Mexico he fell under suspicion, but though he was thrice investigated he escaped without serious trouble, dying in 1596 in the odor of sanctity. Innumerable pilgrims visited his hermitage and he had many disciples, founding a school of Mexican mystics, of whose relations with the Holy Office some fragmentary traces remain. In 1622 his body was translated to the cathedral of Mexico, and when in 1636 the tomb was opened it still breathed forth celestial fragrance. When, soon afterwards, Archbishop Zúñiga returned to Spain, he carried with him a shin-bone as a priceless relic to Búrgos, a fragment of which Cardinal Aguirre assures us still retained its perfume in 1653. The effort to obtain his canonization was commenced by Philip III. and more than a century and a quarter later was still on foot in 1750. His commentary on the Apocalypse

was said to have been written at the command of Philip II. and to have occupied him only eight days.[1]

The Inquisition continued to look with an unfavorable eye on those given to mysticism and it remained as difficult as ever to distinguish between saint and heretic. The Venerable Luis de Granada was one of the most moderate of those who taught the supreme virtues of *recojimiento*, but Melchor Cano had no hesitation in asserting that his books contained doctrines of alumbrados and matters contrary to the faith, while Fray Alonso de la Fuente endeavored to have him prosecuted and styled his book *De la Oracion* the worst of those which conveyed these errors so subtly that only the initiated could discover them.[2] He escaped personal persecution and succeeded in exculpating himself when quoted by the Lutherans of Valladolid as participating in their views on Justification; he died in the odor of sanctity in 1588 and subsequently appeared to a devotee arrayed in a cloak of glory strewn with innumerable stars which were the souls which had been saved by his holy writings, and canonization proceedings were commenced but never concluded.[3] His

[1] De Vita et Rebus Gestis Gregorii Lopesii Commentarius, Romæ, 1751.—Heppe, Geschichte der quietistischen Mystik, p 40.—Molinos, Guide Spirituelle, Lib. I. ch. xvii. No. 134-5.—Ven. Gregor. Lopesii Comment. in Apocalypsin, Romæ, 1756.—Aguirre, Collect. Max. Concil. Hispaniæ, T. VI. pp. 190, 191.

[2] Caballero, Vida de Melchor Cano, p 597.—Barrantes, Aparato para la Historia de Extremadura, Madrid, 1877, T. II. pp. 346-7.

Melchor Cano complained that Luis de Granada wished to make *contemplativos y perfectos* of everybody, teaching the people in the vulgar tongue that which is fitting only for the few. So far was this from being the case that Luis, who was the soberest of the mystics, especially declared that the exercises of mysticism were not suited to all. Some have not the strength either of body or of head. Some are under obligation to perform exterior works; they have not the time for mystical training and ought not to be diverted from their duties. Others again have the soul so unquiet, arid, and undevout that they cannot profit by these exercises.—Oratione et Meditatione, cap. lxv.

[3] Palafox y Mendoza, Obras, Ed. 1752, T. VII. p. 65.—Llorente, III. 123.

writings, by which he is best known, illustrate the difference in the treatment of mysticism between Spain and the rest of Christendom. They were translated into almost all languages and were everywhere read with edification. In 1582 Gregory XIII. wrote to him in praise of them and urged him to complete any other work which he might have in hand and to publish it for the curing of the infirm, the strengthening of the weak, the comfort of the strong, and the glory of both churches, the militant and the triumphant.[1] Yet the writings which earned these unqualified encomiums from the head of the Church failed to satisfy the vigilance of the Spanish Inquisition and were placed on the Index.[2]

Even Santa Teresa de Jesus, or de Ávila, who in 1627, after two solemn votes of the Córtes, was confirmed by Urban VIII. as the patron saint of Spain in conjunction with Santiago[3]—even Santa Teresa could not escape, in spite of the humility and obedience with which she submitted her spiritual

[1] Giovanni da Capugnano, Vita del P. Luigi Granata.

[2] The Index of Valdés, 1559, prohibits the *De la Oracion* and the *Guia de Pecadores* (Reusch, Die Indices, p. 234). Luis issued revised editions, of the *Oracion* in 1567 and of the *Guia* in 1570 (Reusch, Der Index, I. 590). The latter seems to have removed the objections of the Inquisition, but the former failed to do so, for in the 1583 Index of Quiroga the prohibition of the *Oracion* is continued, while that of the *Guia* is limited to editions prior to 1561 (Reusch, Die Indices, p. 437). Luis's name disappears entirely from the 1640 Index of Sotomayor, and in the Índice Último (1790) there are only some works attributed to him, which are pronounced surreptitious.

He endured all this with Christian patience. Shortly before his death he prepared a sermon, which he was unable to deliver, in which he eulogized the Inquisition as "muro de la Iglesia, columna de la verdad, guarda de la fé, tesoro de la religion cristiana, arma contra los hereges, lumbre contra los engaños del enemigo, y toque en que se prueba la fineza de la doctrina, si es falsa ó verdadero."—Menendez y Pelayo, II. 538.

[3] Urbani PP. VIII. Bull *Domini nostri*, 21 Julii, 1627.—Philip III. had not waited for this, but in 1618 had issued a cédula ordering her to be received everywhere as the patroness of the Spanish kingdoms (Archivo de Sevilla, Seccion Tercera, Tomo 35, No. 18) The chapter of the church of Santiago of Seville expressed its displeasure at the injury thus inflicted on St. James (Ibid. No. 25).

gifts to the decision of a succession of ghostly fathers. The bull of canonization recites that she fulfilled her vow of obedience so strictly that she subjected her thoughts to the will of her superiors: when her confessors pronounced her visions to be delusions she, by their command, laughed at and ridiculed Christ whenever he appeared to her, and after she had written a volume on Canticles, at the order of her confessor, she threw it into the fire.[1] It is true that her troubles and those of her disciples were stimulated principally by her own Order of Carmelites, whose enmity she incurred by founding the Barefooted Carmelites pledged to the original rigid observance, but this only indicates how ready a means of attack was afforded by accusations of illuminism. Her biographers are discreetly reticent as to the details of the persecution, but it must have been tolerably sharp. The contemporary Bishop Yepes tells us that, when she first commenced to have visions of God and communicated them to her confessors, they were greatly scandalized and she was on the point of being arrested and imprisoned, but on being examined by the best doctors of the times she escaped.[2] In 1574 her spiritual autobiography was maliciously denounced to the Inquisition by the Princess of Eboli, to whom she had given a MS. copy. The Inquisition kept it for more than ten years without pronouncing upon it, although Quiroga, the inquisitor general, after reading it said that he found in it nothing but good. The Duchess of Alva, who had a MS. copy, was obliged to procure from the Inquisition a licence to read it in private until judgment should be rendered, and finally in 1588 it was printed by Fray Luis de Leon at the special request of the Empress.[3] Even after her canonization, when her writings were held to be inspired, her *Conceptos del Amor divino*, when printed with the works of her disciple Jerónimo Gracian, were put on the

[1] Salazar, Anamnesis Sanctor. Hispan. V. 529.—Cf. Alban Butler, Vies des Saints, VII. 537.

[2] Carta de Yepes (Escritos de S. Teresa, I. 571).

[3] Vicente de la Fuente (Escritos de S. Teresa, I. 3–4).

Index and kept there.[1] When the quarrel broke out between the relaxed Carmelites and the Barefooted Order which she was engaged in founding, the papal nuncio Sega confined her in a convent and denounced her as an unquiet vagabond who was indulging in dissipation under pretext of religion, and she was freely accused of the worst that can be said of a woman—an accusation worth bearing in mind when we meet with similar ones brought against Alumbrados who happen not to have been canonized. An effort was even set on foot to get rid of her by sending her to the Indies.[2] But for the fortunate accident that Philip II. became interested in her she would probably have come down to us as one of the crowd of *beatas revelanderas* whom it was the mission of the Inquisition to suppress.

When, in 1575, she undertook to establish a Barefooted convent in Seville there was endless trouble. A beata of much reputation for sanctity entered it and finding herself unable to endure its rigor wished to get out. She plotted with some priests and on leaving the convent denounced the sisters to the Inquisition as guilty of *cosas de alumbrados*. The triviality of these shows how little was required as a proof of Illuminism. One charge was that they took communion without veils; another arose from the fact that the house being unfitted for a convent, the place of communion was a court-yard exposed to the sun, and each one, as she received the sacrament, went to a corner with her face to the wall to escape the glare. The inquisitors took up the matter and created a terrible scandal by going in a body, with guards, to

[1] Index of Sotomayor, p. 529.—Índice Último, p. 118. Cf. Vicente de la Fuente, *op. cit.* II. 439-40.

[2] Carta de Yepes (*loc. cit.* 568, 571).—S. Teresa, Carta CXIII.—There are two letters attributed to Santa Teresa (XXVII. and LXXV. of the old editions) in which she speaks of being incarcerated and describes her persecution. Señor la Fuente pronounces them apocryphal (Escritos, II. 197, 206), which may be the case, but we can better understand a modern desire to show that she was not imprisoned than an objectless effort, nearly contemporary, to forge a prison for her.

the convent to investigate. Although they found nothing to condemn, Teresa was allowed to leave Seville only on condition of presenting herself before the Inquisition whenever summoned—a ticket of leave which in itself was an imputation of guilt.[1] After her departure there was still greater trouble. The spiritual director of the convent was a priest named Garci-Alvarez, a servant of God, we are told, though ignorant and inexperienced in the interior life. He had been of essential service in the matter of procuring a house, but he undertook to manage it after his own fashion. Under pretext of hearing the confessions of two of the younger sisters, Beatriz de la Madre de Dios and Margarita de la Concepcion, for several months he would be closeted all day with one or the other. The prioress, the Venerable María de S. José, interfered. With the aid of the two girls he got up a new prosecution. Under menaces one of the sisters, of rather weak mind, who was kept for six hours in solitude, confessed all that was wanted. The little community was accused of all sorts of abominations, and Teresa was an infamous procuress who enticed young girls into convents to lead them into a life of shame. The Venerable María was deposed and Beatriz was installed in her place. The trouble continued until the merits of the Barefooted Carmelites were acknowledged and steps were taken in 1579 for their separation from the main body of the Order, when María resumed the priorship.[2]

During all this time Teresa was already the object of intense popular veneration, but this was shared by so many beatas that neither the Inquisition nor the papal authorities had much respect for it. In her case the favor of Philip II. supported her and persecution ceased with the recognition of her Order as a separate organization. When she died, on the

[1] María de S. José, Fundacion del Convento de Sevilla (Escritos de S. Teresa, I. 557).—Llorente, III. 117.

[2] María de S. José, *ubi sup.*—S. Teresa, Cartas CXIII., CCXXIV., CCXXVIII., CCXXXVI., CCXLII., CCXLVI., CCLXVII.

night of the adoption of the Gregorian calendar, October 4–5, 1582, it already numbered sixteen female and fourteen male houses, to spread subsequently throughout all the lands of the Roman obedience. At the instance of Philip III. she was beatified by Paul V. in 1614 and canonized in 1622 by Gregory XV. Her immense renown and the circulation of her writings did much to stimulate the increase of the crowds of beatas who emulated her ecstasies and trances and miracles, and who, had not the Inquisition suppressed them with no gentle hand, might have elevated hysterics into a national religion, for there seemed to be no limit to the capacity of popular credulity.

A similar experience of persecution followed by canonization occurred to Teresa's most illustrious disciple, San Juan de la Cruz. We have seen how fully he taught the doctrine of union with God through love and that the observances of the Church were a hindrance rather than a help to the spiritual man. Yet, though repeatedly denounced to the Inquisitions of Seville, Toledo and Valladolid, those tribunals did not imprison him, and even his writings escaped censure.[1] The Holy Office was probably content to leave him to the vindictiveness of his unreformed Carmelite brethren, which glutted itself on him under pretext of his illuminism. In 1577, with the assent of the papal nuncio Sega, he was seized at Ávila where he was director of Teresa's convent; he was carried to Toledo and confined in the Carmelite convent, where he was scourged so cruelly that his shoulders were permanently distorted and he carried the scars to the grave.

[1] Menendez y Pelayo, II. 540.—Señor Menendez y Pelayo (II. 583) gives various passages from Juan's *Avisos y Sentencias espirituales* to show that he was not addicted to the extravagances of the mystics, but the passages from his *Subida del Monte Carmelo* quoted above prove that he was a link in the chain between Osuna and Molinos. The writings of the Spanish mystics are so emotional that no amount of inconsistency need surprise the student.

Like the other mystics Juan disregarded scholastic theology and based his writings wholly on Scripture, but he submitted himself to the judgment of the Church.—Subida del Monte Carmelo, Prologo (Obras, p. 38).

He was kept in a small cell deprived of light and air and was fed on salt meat, while water was withheld. For nine months it was not known whether he was alive or dead. At length Teresa appealed to Philip II. saying that he was so enfeebled by his sufferings that she feared for his life, but it was only through the miraculous interposition of the Virgin that he was enabled to escape over the walls of the convent at night. In 1579 Philip intervened, and in 1580 Gregory XIII. decreed the separation of the Barefooted Carmelites from their persecuting brethren, but even in the new Order Juan could not find permanent peace. It was soon torn with dissensions over questions of organization and discipline. The two factions were headed respectively by Jerónimo Gracian and Padre Doria, known as Nicolás de Jesus María. The Gracian faction, to which Juan belonged, was defeated; he was left without special functions and there was even talk of sending him to the Indies, which seem to have been regarded as a sort of penal settlement. In 1591 he asked to be allowed to retire to the desert convent of Peñuela in the Sierra Morena, in order to abandon himself wholly to a life of contemplation. This was granted, but the enmity of his antagonists was still unsatisfied. The visitor appointed to oversee the convents of Seville and Granada proceeded to make inquisition into his past life, on the charge of undue familiarity with the nuns who had been under his spiritual direction. By violent means it was not difficult to obtain the desired testimony. Juan was regarded as a ruined man and his friends feared to be compromised; those who held his letters burned them, to the infinite loss of the faithful, for they were full of spiritual instruction. At the next General Chapter, in 1592, the visitor was rewarded with promotion to the provincialate of Granada and, although Juan had meanwhile died in obscurity and disgrace, he hastened thither to complete his work. As he approached Granada, an old nun, Beatriz de San Miguel, was comforted with a revelation from God that he would never reach the city alive. She was ridiculed, for he was

already at Alcalá la Real and was expected in Granada that day, but news soon came that he had fallen sick at Alcalá; in a few days he died, and his body was brought to Granada.[1] In 1726 Juan was canonized and in the proceedings his writings were characterized as fruitful through heavenly learning set forth in a style so marvellous as to show that such knowledge must be of divine revelation and not acquired by earthly endeavor.[2]

There seemed to be no rest for these poor souls who despised the joys of life and placed all their happiness in contemplative union with God. Of all the group which surrounded Santa Teresa there was none who rendered her such service as Fray Jerónimo Gracian. For ten years before her death, from 1572 to 1582, he was her spiritual director on whom she leaned for guidance in all things. In her Seville troubles of 1575 he was prosecuted as an alumbrado by the Inquisition, but the proof was deemed insufficient and the case was abandoned. The vengeance of his unreformed Carmelite brethren was not so easily eluded. Through their influence the papal nuncio confined him in Alcalá and subjected him to severe penance of fasting and scourging, which lasted till the separation of the Orders in 1580. In the first organization of the Barefooted Carmelites he was naturally chosen Provincial, an office which he held till 1585, becoming subsequently provincial vicar of Portugal. In the struggle between the factions which rent the new Order he was worsted; in 1587 he was punished on various charges, including disobedience, rebellion, and improper relations with women. In 1592 he was formally expelled and was deprived of his functions as a priest until he should enter some other Order. This was condemnation to a living death, but these pious mystics, in their yearnings for God, seem to have retained all human passions and emotions save that of mercy. Gra-

[1] José de Jesus María, Vida de S. Juan de la Cruz (Escritos de S. Teresa, II. 511–14).—Relacion Sumaria, §§ vii. viii. (Obras, pp. 21–26).

[2] Œuvres de Saint Jean de la Croix, Ed. Migne, p. 370.

cian betook himself to Rome to appeal to the pope, at the same time fearing that he should be sent to the galleys. There he was told to enter some other Order and he applied successively to the Carthusians, Franciscans, Dominicans and Capuchins, but none would admit him. Another appeal to the pope brought a refusal to listen to him, accompanied with the remark that he should deem himself lucky in escaping the galleys. He wandered to Naples and thence to Sicily, where the Countess Olivares, wife of the viceroy, favored him. Returning to Naples he was met with a papal brief authorizing him to enter the Barefooted Augustinians, a new Order then forming, and to found for it a convent in Rome and one in Naples. He at once took ship for Rome, but was scarce out of the Bay of Naples when his vessel was captured by a Moorish corsair and he was carried to Tunis. There he lay until July, 1595, suffering incredible hardships, confined in irons in an underground dungeon into which sometimes as many as a thousand unhappy captives were crowded. To these he administered the consolations of religion, finding content in the strange apostolate thus thrust upon him. At last money was advanced for his ransom, and in August, 1595, he was landed at Genoa, whence he begged his way to Rome, nearly starving on the road, and applied to the pope for a brief, authorizing him, as was customary at the time, to beg for the purpose of repaying his ransom, which with interest amounted to 2000 ducats. He also asked the pope to assign him to a religious Order; the matter was referred to the Congregation *de Regularibus*, which decreed his return to the Barefooted Carmelites, thus reversing the sentence of expulsion. The procurator of the Order protested; the cardinals replied that he had suffered enough to cancel the gravest offences and the decree was issued by the pope and sent to Spain. There the brethren refused obedience, and the auditor of the Camara issued censures against the rebels. Finally the matter was settled by his joining the unreformed Carmelites, who gladly welcomed him. His reputation for learning stood deservedly

high, and he was appointed by Cardinal Deza as his theologian, in which capacity he was employed, until 1600, in many important affairs connected with the Roman Inquisition, of which Deza was senior member. When, in 1600, the Congregation *de Propaganda Fide* was instituted, he was sent to Africa with extraordinary powers, as bearer of the indulgences of the jubilee year. Thence he returned to Spain, where he remained for some years, but the malignity of his former brethren was still unappeased, and at one time he was forced to leave Valladolid by a scandalous report that he was embezzling money collected for the canonization of Teresa. In 1604 he went to Flanders to print his works, for his pen was a busy one. There he lived in high esteem until his death in 1614, when he was honored with solemn obsequies. Yet two of his writings—his scholia on Teresa's *Conceptos del Amor divino* and his *Diez Lamentaciones*—were condemned and were never removed from the Index.[1]

Two comrades of Gracian, Fray Antonio de Jesus and Padre Mariano, are mentioned as sharing his early persecutions. In fact, of the band of zealous mystics whom Santa Teresa gathered around her, there were few who escaped shame and suffering in some form or other.

We have seen how the early fervor of Loyola exposed him to suspicion, and there was a strong tendency to mysticism

[1] Llorente, II. 448.—Escritos de S. Teresa, T. I. 560, 561; T. II. pp. 154, 157, 189, 196.—Ochoa, Epistolario Español, II. 49.—Mármol, Vida del R. P. F. Jerónimo Gracian (Escritos de S. Teresa, II. 452-84).—Index of Sotomayor, 1640, p. 529.—Índice Último, p. 118.—V. de la Fuente (Escritos de S. Teresa, I. 378).

Jerónimo Gracian was one of the most sensible of the mystics. Though fully initiated in all the mysteries of the light within, transmutation into God, annihilation, etc., he lays much stress on love of one's neighbor, morality, repentance and the due observance of the precepts of God and of the Church. Indeed, he says that salvation and perfection can be obtained by obeying the law, natural, divine and human, without other spiritual exercise (Itinerario de la Perfeccion, Cap. VI. § 3), and he warns the devotee that the pleasure he finds in mental prayer must not lead him to neglect his duties (Ibid. Cap. V. § 2).

among those who joined him. When Lainez founded the Society of Jesus in Parma and it grew rapidly, a storm arose against some innocent devotees known as *Contemplanti* (evidently similar to the Spanish *recojidos*) and this extended to the Jesuits who were accused of having given rise to them.[1] In fact, in the Church of that worldly time, it required some of the contempt for earthly things and flaming ardor of devotion characteristic of the mystics to lead men to embrace the career laid out by Loyola and offering at first so few apparent temptations to ambition. Yet Loyola was careful to avoid the pitfalls so numerous in mystical theology and taught his disciples to use a mental prayer, which his legend speedily asserted to have been revealed to him by God—the *Ejercicio de las Tres Potencias*, or exercise of the three faculties, memory, intellect and will, differing little from the meditation which with the mystics was the stepping-stone to contemplation.[2] His followers however soon outgrew his wise restrictions and indulged in all the extravagances of the more advanced school. It is therefore not surprising that in Spain, where sensitiveness on such subjects was so highly developed, the whole Order should be exposed to suspicion. Melchor Cano, who hated the Jesuits, had no hesitation in denouncing them as *alumbrados*, such as the devil has constantly thrust into the Church, and he prophesied that they would complete what the Gnostics had commenced.[3] More serious was another attack on them by another Dominican, Fray Alonso de la Fuente of Llerena, a learned man, who was much trusted by the Inquisition and employed by it as a *calificador*. He described them as the source of all the Illuminism which afflicted Spain. They practised and taught, he said, the contemplation of the Passion of Christ as an exercise rewarded with the highest spiritual gifts, including impeccability, with the corollary that sensual indulgence was no sin to the illumi-

[1] Ribadeneira Vit. Ign. Loyolæ Lib. III. c. vii.

[2] Alfonso Rodriguez, Ejercicio de la Perfeccion, P. I. Trat. v. c. 7, 12.

[3] Caballero, Vida de Melchor Cano, p. 526. Cf. p. 359.

nated soul—the same doctrine which the Jesuits a century later succeeded in imputing to Molinos. The visions and revelations of their disciples, he argued, were the work of demons whom they controlled through their skill in sorcery and magic. They decried vocal prayer, the fasts prescribed by the Church, and other customary mortifications. All this has especial interest as an illustration of the manner in which such accusations were brought against the mystics—accusations which inquisitorial methods could readily substantiate on the friendless and defenceless. The Jesuits however were by this time neither friendless nor defenceless, as Fray Alonso found to his cost. He commenced his assault in 1576, in Portugal, by presenting three memorials containing these assertions to the Inquisitor General the Cardinal Infant Henry, to the Dominican provincial and to the Inquisition. Unluckily for him the Cardinal Infant was well affected to the Jesuits; he seized the memorials and sent copies of them to Philip II., to the Spanish Inquisitor General Quiroga and to the papal nuncio, with a request for the condign punishment of the overzealous *fraile*. The result did not correspond to his expectations, for the Spanish Inquisition was disposed to treat Fray Alonso mercifully. He was reprimanded, required to retract, and relegated to the convent of Porta Cœli in Seville, with orders to meddle no more in matters connected with the Jesuits or the Inquisition. Cardinal Henry was dissatisfied with this and wished him sent to Portugal for trial or to have the affair submitted to the Holy See, but Philip was jealous of the independence of his Inquisition, and while the matter was under discussion it was solved by the sudden death of Fray Alonso, enabling a Jesuit to express the pious hope that God had pardoned him and that his crime would not cause his perdition, although the manner of his ending was of sinister significance.[1]

There were also individual Jesuits of the highest sanctity

[1] Barrantes, Aparato para la Historia de Extremadura, II. 332–47.

whose mystic tendencies involved them in trouble. In 1559 San Francisco de Borja was incriminated, by the Lutherans burnt at Valladolid, as a believer in justification by faith and in various mystic heresies. Melchor Cano attacked him as an *alumbrado* and the Inquisition took steps for his prosecution, but he learned that he was about to be arrested and escaped to Rome, where the agents of the Inquisition found themselves unable to harm him.[1] In 1565 he succeeded Lainez as General of the Order and died in the odor of sanctity in 1572, to be beatified in 1624 and canonized in 1671. The Inquisitor General Valdés had at least the satisfaction of putting his *Obras del Cristiano* in the Index of 1559, but it disappears after that of Sandoval in 1612.[2] Father Baltasar Alvarez, one of the first to admit the reality of the divine graces bestowed on Santa Teresa, was accused of Illuminism to the Inquisition, but escaped without punishment.[3] Jerónimo de Ripalda, another Jesuit confessor of Teresa, was imprisoned by the Inquisition of Valladolid on a similar charge. He confessed some of the errors attributed to him and cast himself on the mercy of the tribunal, accepting penance and abjuring *de vehementi* in 1574. Quiroga, the inquisitor general, was so impressed by his repentance that his punishment was diminished and he was soon rehabilitated. He died in 1618 in the odor of sanctity.[4]

As the Society of Jesus grew powerful persecution ceased

[1] Llorente, II. 106–8. Cf. Menendez y Pelayo, II. 335.

[2] Reusch, Die Indices, pp. 237, 438.—Reusch, Der Index, I. 591.

It is related of San Francisco de Borja that he daily devoted eight or ten hours to mental prayer, which, after his accession to the Generalate, he was obliged to reduce to five or six. In this contemplation he was motionless, as though carved in stone, and so wholly abstracted from external things that on one occasion, when a wooden column fell on him and inflicted a serious wound, he knew nothing of it till the bystanders lifted it off and carried him to bed.—Sgambata, Compendium Vitæ S. Fran. Borgiæ, cap. xxi.

[3] Menendez y Pelayo, II. 540.—Bishop Palafox describes him as *muy alumbrado de Dios* (Obras, VII. 56).

[4] Llorente, II. 466.

and its members were allowed to indulge their mystic yearnings in peace. Alfonso Rodriguez, who died in 1616 at the age of ninety, had been in the Order for seventy years. He was not given to ecstasies but was so assiduous in prayer that he never left his cell except for necessary duties, and when he died his reputation for sanctity was such that at his funeral the crowd endeavored to touch the corpse with rosaries and begged for relics.[1] In his *Ejercicio de la Perfeccion* he recommends only the meditation prescribed by Loyola, but admits that there is another kind of prayer which is indescribable; no instructions can be given for its attainment, for it is a gift of God and not to be acquired by human effort.[2] More developed was the mysticism of Luis de la Puente, who died in 1625 at the age of seventy. In him the ardor of divine love was so strong that in his ecstasies he shone with a divine light which filled his cell; he would be lifted from the ground and the whole building would shake as though about to fall; angels were often seen ministering to him in his sickness, which lasted with little interruption for thirty years; he had the gift of prophecy and of divining the thoughts of his penitents; when he died his garments were torn into shreds and his hair was cut off to be preserved as relics.[3] He taught the heretical doctrine that prayer is a satisfaction for sin; his views as to resignation to the will of God approach nearly to the Quietism condemned in Molinos and lead directly to the deductions which were drawn from the writings of the latter and were so severely anathematized.[4] Yet he and his books escaped animadversion both in Spain and Italy.

[1] Alegambe, Bibliotheca Scriptorum Societatis Jesu, p. 20.

[2] Alfonso Rodriguez, Ejercicio de la Perfeccion, P. I. Trat. v. c. 4, 7.—I quote from the translation by Antonio Putignano, Venice, 1627.

[3] Alegambe, *op. cit.* p. 316.—Nieremberg, Honor del Gran Patriarcha San Ignacio, Madrid, 1645, p. 513.

[4] Luis de la Puente, Guia Spirituale, P. II. Trat. 1, cap. 15, No. 3; cap. 18, No. 2.—I quote from the translation by the Abate Alessandro Sperelli, Rome, 1628.

It is not easy to apprehend the reasons influencing the Inquisition to severity or lenity. Of the former there is another instance in the case of a man who was subsequently recognized as meriting the highest honors of the Church—Juan de Ribera, Patriarch-Archbishop of Valencia, who signalized his zeal by bringing about the expulsion of the unhappy Moriscos in 1611, who had trouble with the Inquisition on the score of Illuminism, and who was beatified in 1696.[1]

All these were merely sporadic cases. In spite of the alarm which the very name of Alumbrado created, during the period which we have been considering the efforts of the Inquisition were directed against scattered enthusiasts who usually happened to be persons particularly eminent for Christian virtues and whose devotion to practices, recognized for centuries as specially laudable, was untainted by disobedience or immorality. Once, however, it had the fortune to light upon a community of so-called heretics, consisting of pastors and people, full of zeal for their form of devotion and inspired with the spirit of propagandism. This single opportunity was due to the sagacity of Fray Alonso de la Fuente, who diversified his assault on the Jesuits in 1576 with the discovery of a nest of heretics in his own town of Llerena, and as they were obscure and friendless there was

[1] Menendez y Pelayo, II. 540.

San José de Calasanz, the founder of the *Scuole Pie*, has also been cited as an example of the persecution by the Inquisition of those who were subsequently canonized (Llorente, II. 123), but his case has no relation to our subject. It is true that he was a mystic who found time during a strenuously useful life to indulge in contemplation, and that he was abundantly gifted with miraculous and prophetic power, but his tribulations were with the Roman Inquisition in 1642, at the mature age of 86, and were occasioned by the intrigues of an ambitious subordinate, the Padre Mario Sozzi, who hoped to replace him by embroiling him with the Holy Office on the charge of seizing some papers belonging to it. He died in 1648; a century later, in 1748, he was beatified, and in 1769 he was canonized.—Talenti, Vita del B. Giuseppe Calasanzio, Lib. IV. c. 7; Lib. V. c. 1, 2 (Roma, 1753).—Benedicti PP. XIV. De Servorum Dei Beatificatione, Lib. III. c. xxx. Nos 17, 18.

no difficulty in establishing their guilt, for Llerena was the seat of an inquisitorial tribunal whose methods speedily brought conviction.

We can well imagine that the enormous repute of San Pedro de Alcántara had rendered mysticism prevalent in his native province of Extremadura. His niece, Sor Francisca de la Concepcion, is recorded as a beata enjoying in the highest degree the graces of trances, revelations, prophecies, miracles and the saintly privilege of leaving behind her an incorruptible body, though she seems in some way to have missed canonization.[1] Similar manifestations continued to be prevalent throughout the province. In 1629 appeared biographies of nuns distinguished for their sanctity in the single convent of the Conception in Cáceres—eight are specified by name on the title page and we are told that there were numerous others.[2] In fact it would be impossible at the present date to enumerate all whose mystic enthusiasm was rewarded with the illumination of the inward light and union with the Godhead. Doubtless this was partially owing to the desolate condition of Extremadura, arising from the old border warfare along the Portuguese frontier and the enormous drain upon its male population from emigration to the Indies. Both Cortes and Pizarro were natives of the province and the renown of their exploits drew thousands of their countrymen from the sterile hills of their native land to El Dorado of the West, leaving numerous *despoblados* or abandoned villages to increase the poverty of the community. In such a population, with the women hopelessly in excess of the men, the dreariness of joyless existence naturally stimulated the desire to seek refuge in ecstatic revery.

In 1576, Fray Alonso, whose scent, as we have seen, was very keen for alumbrados, got upon the track of illuminism in Llerena. He speedily published the fact in a sermon in

[1] Barrantes, Aparato para la Historia de Extremadura, I. 83.

[2] Barrantes, I. 431–2.

which he said that he had heard of certain people who, under an exterior of religious austerity, gave free rein to their sensual appetites, which had been the ruin of France, Flanders, Germany and England. Evidently the charge of immorality cannot have been applicable at least to all the mystics of Llerena, for a woman in the congregation was so indignant at the assertion that she arose and retorted "Padre, the lives of these people are better, and their faith is sounder than yours." It was evidently an honest burst of feeling but a most imprudent one. The woman was promptly arrested by the Inquisition, and under its methods a single culprit was sufficient for the detection of all accomplices. Arrests followed rapidly, and the circle of the incriminated spread so widely that the tribunal appealed to headquarters for aid. Philip II. and the Supreme Council sent thither Francisco Soto, Bishop of Salamanca, whose experience as inquisitor of Córdova, Seville and Toledo rendered him peculiarly well adapted for the emergency. He set to work vigorously and tried a large number of cases, until his career was cut short by death, January 29, 1578—poisoned, it was said, by his physician, who was treating him for a urinary trouble and who long lay in prison under the accusation.

Our knowledge of the details of the case is but fragmentary. The only original document accessible is an account of a single *auto de fé* which has been imperfectly printed by Señor Barrantes. In this *auto* there were punished nine ecclesiastics, with two laymen and two women. One woman was discharged and mention is made of a man and woman still in prison. The number of those inculpated, however, must have been much larger, for the so-called heresy spread to Zafra, Mérida and the neighboring villages, and the allusions in the sentences show that the priests had a large number of disciples. The doctrines ascribed to them were that contemplation of the five wounds of Christ fulfilled the whole law of God and rendered unnecessary vocal prayer and fasts and the purchase of indulgences. Female disciples were

dissuaded from marriage and were induced to become beatas, wearing short hair, gray mantles and large hoods; they were moreover taught to steal from their parents in order to pay for masses and give alms. The accusation, however, best fitted to excite popular odium was that of immorality—that the priests taught their penitents that there was no sin in intercourse, which moreover relieved them from the effects of their contemplative excesses and the consequent pains and tremblings and visions. The leader of the sect, Padre Hernando Alvarez, was said to have seduced several of his spiritual daughters, and thirty-four victims were ascribed to the next in authority, Padre Cristóbal Chamizo. As to the reality of this it is not easy to arrive at a definite opinion. Such charges were a matter of course, and we have seen in the case of Santa Teresa and her disciples how easy it was to obtain testimony which, in the inquisitorial process, could generally be confirmed by confessions elicited through torture. On the other hand we know that the seduction of penitents was a prevalent vice of the ecclesiastics of the period, especially in Spain, and to this the high-wrought emotions of mysticism opened a dangerous avenue, in which the frenzied seeking for the raptures of divine love could readily be converted into grosser and more earthly passions. To a spiritual director not proof against the seductions of the flesh, the conduct of a soul through the mystic paths of illumination and union offered opportunities which were sometimes unquestionably turned to account. In this balancing of probabilities there is evidence of guilelessness in the indignant protest of the woman which led to the prosecutions, and a still stronger testimony is furnished by another of the alumbrados, Juan Bernal, a shoemaker of Llerena, whose conviction of the innocence of his fellow disciples was so strong that he travelled to the court and presented to Philip II. a memorial in their defence, in which he maintained the excellence of their doctrines—a zeal for which he was rewarded

at the *auto de fé* with an extra punishment of two hundred lashes.

Of the fate of the enthusiasts, deluders or deluded, we have but insufficient information. Apparently all confessed, recanted, and applied for reconciliation, for it does not appear that any of them were burnt. Some of the leaders were sent to the galleys, where Hernando Alvarez died. Others were scourged and sentenced to perpetual prison. The Bachiller Rodrigo Vasquez, cura of La Morena, in addition to scourging, was fined 40,000 maravedís, for the benefit of the Inquisition, which shows that the profitable side of persecution was kept in view when the culprits had wealth to render it possible. The varied punishments were at least sufficiently severe effectually to discourage illuminism, of which we hear nothing more in organized shape in Extremadura. The affair made an immense sensation. Paramo, writing twenty years later, speaks of it as a matter in which the diligence of the Inquisition preserved Spain from a most serious peril, and in his description of the sect of Alumbrados he shows how completely, in the minds of the orthodox, the idea of their immoral tendencies dominated everything else. Such, he says, were the Alumbrados, who preferred to be broken rather than to obey their prelates. Such was their love for the things of earth that they fell blinded into the abyss of sin. Involved in obscene pleasures they did not deserve to be illuminated by God. They were blackened by lust and the ardor of concupiscence; fevered with burning desire they dreamed of rivers of delights in which they could not slake their thirst or satisfy the hunger of their passions. Thus they slumbered amid the swelling waves of passion; they did not sleep, for the quiet repose of contemplation and devotion does not reach the soul amid worldly pleasures.[1]

[1] Barrantes, Aparato para la Historia de Extremadura, II. 329, 347–57.—V. de la Fuente, Hist. Ecles. de España, III. 102–4.—Miscelanea de Zapata (Memorial Histórico Español, XI. 75).—Cipriano de Valera, Dos Tratados (Reformistas Antiguos Españoles, p. 272).—Paramo de Orig. Off. S. Inquis. pp. 302, 681–2, 688–9, 854.

Mysticism, stimulated by the example of Santa Teresa, continued to flourish, and popular veneration to develop a crowd of beatas, of whom more anon, but the example made at Llerena seems to have checked for a time all tendency to disseminate its practices among the people. For nearly half a century we hear nothing of any inquisitorial proceedings on a large scale, although the Edict of Denunciations continued to be published annually with its summons to inform on all who were given to any of the errors there described. At the same time there appears to have been a growing desire to suppress all mystic tendencies which at length found expression in 1623 in unmistakable fashion.

The beatification of Santa Teresa in 1614, followed by her canonization in 1622 and the beatification in the latter year of San Pedro of Alcántara, cannot but have given fresh stimulus to the mystic fervor which was becoming too demonstrative to be agreeable to the authorities. This was particularly the case in Seville. A priest of that city named Fernando Mendez had especial reputation for sanctity: when he celebrated mass he fell into a trance and uttered terrible roars; he taught his disciples to invoke his intercession in their prayers as though he were already a saint in heaven; they eagerly treasured fragments of his garments as relics; he presided over a congregation of beatas, and after mass in the oratory they would strip off their religious garments and dance with indecent vigor—as one of them expressed it, they were drunk with the love of God. It was not only the lower classes that revered him, but the noblest dames of the city; as many as thirty coaches could be counted of a morning around the portal of the Franciscan convent de Vallè to which he had retired. He had trances and visions, in one of which it was announced to him that he would die on July 20, 1616, and go immediately to glory. He prepared for it by passing his days in contemplation and diminishing his food to a little fish and water till he was reduced to the extremity of weakness, and when the time was near he distributed his

garments among his disciples, and bequeathed his virtues to one and to another, saying that he had authority from God to do so. When the fatal day arrived he placed himself at the altar at four in the morning and remained there saying mass until three the next morning, but even this extraordinary exertion was endured by his emaciated frame and he was reserved for a more melancholy death. To his disappointed followers he could only say "The demon has given me a great blow," but even this experience did not disenchant them, and he continued to enjoy the reputation of a saint.[1]

Hysterical emotions are proverbially contagious, and a considerable portion of the population of Seville became a prey to an epidemic of mysticism, stimulated by the half-crazed enthusiasts and shrewd impostors whom such a condition of popular feeling could not fail to bring forth. There was no attempt at concealment and evidently no belief that any suspicion of heresy attached to the movement, or that it in any way transcended the recognized limits of religious ardor. One of the groups of mystics was popularly known as *la Granada*, because it held its meetings in the chapel of Nuestra Señora de la Granada in the cathedral. Its founder was a monk named Gomez Camacho, who was succeeded in the leadership by the Jesuit Padre Rodrigo Alvarez, and he was followed successively by his brethren, Padres Hernando de Mata and Bernardo de Toro, the latter of whom was subsequently stationed in Rome.[2] Thus the organization had continued publicly for a considerable period without attracting the attention of the Inquisition, and was under the direction of the Jesuits. This latter fact suggests a possible explanation of the turmoil which followed. The mystics were chiefly connected with the Franciscans and Jesuits; the Dominicans boasted that none who were compromised were under the direction of confessors of their Order. The hatred

[1] Menendez y Pelayo, II. 547-8.—MSS. of Bodleian Library, Arch S. 130.
[2] Barrantes, Aparato, II. 363.

between the different religious bodies at this time was becoming fiercer than ever, especially between the Dominicans and Jesuits, and the former may very likely have seen an opportunity of striking an effective blow at their antagonists.

Be this as it may, when Bishop Andreas Pacheco was made inquisitor general in 1622 he lost no time in taking effective steps to set the seal of disapprobation on the doctrines and practices of mysticism. Information was conveyed to him of the heresies said to be current in Seville, and he ordered the tribunal there to investigate and report. There could be no difficulty in gathering from the gossip of the town an abundant harvest of follies and extravagances, to which we may readily believe that the Dominicans were not unwilling contributors. The result was seen when, on May 9, 1623, Pacheco issued an Edict of Grace, granting the customary term of thirty days in which those who should come forward and denounce themselves or others should be reconciled in secret, with a penance salutary to their souls and not involving confiscation or other damage to their descendants. Appended to this was a formidable list of seventy-six errors ascribed to the so-called Alumbrados—the result of the secret inquiry made by the local tribunal. The list is important as showing the advance that had been made since the Edict of 1568 in attributing heresies to the mystics. There is a repetition, with a somewhat fuller enumeration, of the earlier condemnation of beliefs and practices which were common to all mystics and which in numerous cases had earned canonization —that the trembling and burning and fainting which they experienced was a sign of grace and of the influence of the Holy Ghost—that on reaching a certain stage of perfection they could see the Divine Essence and the mysteries of the Trinity—that they were governed directly by the Holy Ghost, whose inspiration they followed in what they did or left undone—that in contemplation they dismissed all thought and concentrated themselves in the presence of God—that one could reach such a state of perfection that grace drowned all

the faculties—that in the state of union with God the will is subordinated—that in trances God is clearly seen in his glory —that mental prayer renders other works superfluous and that other duties, whether religious or worldly, can be neglected in order to devote one's self wholly to it.

Besides these there are numerous important errors, a portion of which are included in the Edict of 1568—errors which had come to be commonly attributed to the Alumbrados: impeccability—the elevation of mental prayer to the dignity of a sacrament—the uselessness of pious works defined concretely, such as vocal prayer, fasting, the use of holy water and images, listening to sermons, invoking the intercession of saints, etc.—communion in more than one wafer as more efficacious—promiscuous intercourse among the elect and indecent actions in the confessional—teaching wives to refuse conjugal duty to their husbands—forcing girls to take vows of chastity and to become nuns—breathing on the mouths of female penitents to communicate to them the love of God—that the secrets of the confessional can be revealed —that the perfected have the power to grant absolution even in all reserved cases—that those who follow this doctrine will escape purgatory, and that many who have refused to do so have come to them from purgatory to beg release, when they give them an *Evangelio* and see them fly to heaven. One article would seem to show that among the devotees, as was usually the case, there was at least one person who boasted of bearing the stigmata, of conversing with God, and of living solely upon the sacrament.[1]

[1] MSS. of Bibliothèque Nationale of Paris, fonds Dupuy, 673, fol. 181.

Barrantes (Aparato, III. 364–70) prints this edict from a copy less perfect than that of Paris. It omits the second proposition, "Que esta oracion [mental] es sacramento." The 44th, "Que los actos son mas meritorios quando hay menos devocion sensible," which is quite intelligible as a high Quietistic doctrine, but is rendered inculpably orthodox in the Barrantes version by the substitution of *mas* for *menos*. The 43d in the Paris copy develops the complete theory of Quietism: "Que en el estado de perfectos y vida unitiva por amor de Dios, si le dijere Dios al alma formalmente ser

The articles thus covered not only the extravagances of mysticism but a large part of the practices essential to it—practices which, though condemned by the Edict of Denunciations long in force, had continued to be regarded as especially holy and had for ages been sealed with the approbation of the Church. Although the older edict had doubtless been published annually with due regularity the new one showed that the Inquisition was about to take hold of the matter in earnest, and it seems to have been as startling as a thunderbolt from a cloudless sky. On Pentecost, June 4, it was read in all the churches and was repeated on June 11. The greater part of the most pious population of Seville found itself suddenly arraigned for heresy. Mysticism had become fashionable and large numbers of women, not under Dominican guidance, had become infected, from duchesses and marchionesses down. They rushed at once to obtain absolution and reconciliation within the thirty days allowed by the

buena; sustanzialmente seria buena, y que en este caso no tiene el alma que obrar ni querer, ni no querer, ni que hacer."

Malvasia (Cathologus omnium Hæresum et Conciliorum, Romæ, 1661, p. 269) gives a list of fifty alumbrado errors from this list of Pacheco. Cf. Bernino, Historia di tutte l' Heresie, Venezia, 1717, T. IV. p. 613.

It is a coincidence worth remarking that in this same year, 1623, the Minim Fernando de Caldera published in Madrid his *Mistica Teologia*—perhaps the craziest of the mystic books. It is cast in the form of instructions from Christ who speaks throughout in the first person to the disciple, and it reveals the most intimate familiarity with the secrets of the other world. It teaches Illuminism and Quietism of the most exalted kind. The intellect is to be suspended and the will abandoned to God who does with it as he pleases, infusing it with supernatural light and admitting it to a knowledge of the divine mysteries. The sufferings which afflict the devotee are sent by God to tempt him. These sometimes take the form of lubricious temptations—if they come from the flesh they are to be overcome with austerities, if from pride, with humiliation, if they are passive they are to be met with patience and resignation, for God who sends them will remove them in his own time with great benefit to the soul (Mistica Teologia, Lib. II. c. 1, 4, 5, 6). Molinos taught nothing quite so dangerous, but though a translation of the work was published in Rome in 1658, the author and his book escaped condemnation in both Spain and Italy.

Edict of Grace. A letter written from Seville on June 15 says that as soon as it was published an inquisitor with his secretary established himself in San Pablo (a Dominican church in which the *autos de fé* were customarily celebrated) eating and sleeping there, and on duty from 5 A. M. until 10 P. M. with only an intermission of an hour for meals, but that he could not despatch a twentieth part of the penitents who applied and that an extension of the thirty days would be required.[1] That the enthusiasts had been regularly organized is shown by a clause in the edict commanding the surrender of all rules or instructions for their congregations and assemblies, as well as all books containing the condemned propositions, while the close connection between the new heresy and recognized sanctity is seen by the command extending to accounts of the ecstasies and revelations of all who had not been enrolled in the catalogue of saints. This order, if generally enforced, would have made a very serious inroad on the pious literature of the period.

Nothing, in fact, had been further from the intentions of the mystics than to wander from the fold of the Church. There were impostors among them who traded on the credulity of the masses and on their thirst for the marvellous, but there were no persistent heretics. It was necessary of course for the Inquisition to impress the popular mind by the condemnation of a few culprits, and an *auto de fé* was held, November 30, 1624, in which eleven so-called Alumbrados appeared, but eight of them were confessed impostors, whose cases will be considered hereafter. Of the remaining three one was the Padre Fernando Mendez. The wretched and enfeebled old man had died in the *carceles secretas* of the Inquisition, and his effigy was borne in the procession, his revelations, trances, visions and prophecies were declared false and his

[1] Barrantes, II. 371–2.—There is doubtless exaggeration in this. Another authority states the number of persons inculpated in Seville at 695 (Ibid. p. 363).

disciples were ordered to surrender all the articles which they had treasured as relics of him. Another was Antonio de la Cruz, a mulatto slave belonging to Francisco Blasco. He was not only a mystic, believing in the supreme virtue of mental prayer, and in union with God, but had indulged in some unorthodox speculations as to the power of Satan, who he said could do more than God as he was more cunning and that a single claw of his was more powerful than all the angels. Yet he was let off with abjuration *de levi* and deprivation of the sacrament except at Easter, Pentecost and Christmas; he was required to select an exemplary confessor and was warned that if in future he meddled with ecstasies and revelations he should have two hundred lashes and four years in the galleys. The third was a priest named Francisco de Castillo, whose trances had been so frequent and uncontrollable that they would frequently seize him in the act of eating. He was condemned, not only as a teacher of Illuminism, but for having improper relations with many of his female penitents, for claiming that the sins of mankind were forgiven through his merits and that the Church of the future was to be reformed by the congregation over which he presided, he being possessed of the spirit of Jesus and his followers of that of the apostles. Yet for all this he was only required to abjure *de levi*, to be deprived forever of the power to hear confessions, to be confined for four years in a convent during which time he was to celebrate mass only at Easter, Pentecost and Christmas, and to fast three days of the week, and after its expiration to be banished forever from the district of Seville, with a warning that if he did not abandon his visions and revelations he would be more severely dealt with.[1]

So slender an outcome of the repression of the intense mystical excitement which had existed in Seville would seem to be an acknowledgment on the part of the Inquisition that it had taken a new departure and that it had wisely not borne

[1] MSS. of Bodleian Library, Arch S. 130.

too heavily on offences which at most were but exaggerations of previously accepted beliefs. This view is confirmed, moreover, by the remarkable leniency of the penalties inflicted at the *auto de fé*. The object had evidently been gained; the stamp of reprobation had been set on mysticism and it was needless to deepen it with wanton cruelty.

About two years later, on February 28, 1627, another *auto de fé* was held in the church of San Pablo. In this only two mystics were included, but they were perhaps the most prominent in Seville, the priest Maestro Juan de Villalpando, who had been in charge of one of the parishes of the city, and Madre Catalina de Jesus, a Carmelite beata. Their cases excited intense popular interest. Although San Pablo was distant from the Inquisition, by midnight crowds commenced to assemble all along the route, and when the procession started at 7 A. M., in spite of all precautions it could scarce force its way through the thronging masses. Madre Catalina for thirty-eight years had been sick with the love of God and her mere life was regarded as a miracle by her numerous disciples, priests and laymen, men and women, who treasured as relics fragments of her garments or other objects that had touched her person. She seems to have been an author, for her writings, both printed and in MS., were ordered to be surrendered, and she was accused of improper relations with a priest—presumably Villalpando—who reverenced her as his guide and teacher. The evidence of a hundred and forty-nine witnesses had been taken against her, showing her to be guilty of the practices which were now condemned. She was sentenced to confinement for six years in a hospital or convent where she was to earn her support by labor, and to recite audibly every day a third of the rosary, with Friday fasting and confession to a confessor selected for her. Villalpando was condemned as a leader of alumbrados; he had a congregation of men and women who obeyed him implicitly in all things, temporal as well as spiritual. His teaching must have been voluminous for two hundred and seventy-five prop-

ositions were qualified against him, comprising most of the matters condemned in Pacheco's edict. He was required to retract twenty-two articles, which he did with a protest to the effect that he had entertained them in a Catholic sense. He was sentenced to four years' confinement in a convent, after which he was not to leave Seville without permission of the Inquisition, he was required to recite audibly every day a portion of the rosary, he was deprived perpetually of the faculty of preaching, confessing and administering the sacraments, and he was fined two hundred ducats for costs.[1]

The affair was concluded in 1630 by an *auto de fé* in which eight Alumbrados were burnt alive and six in effigy.[2] We have no details of this holocaust and can only guess at the reasons for this rigor. The Inquisition had previously shown itself rather merciful in its sentences, and there was really so little to distinguish orthodox from heterodox mysticism that the obstinacy which would induce a fanatic to dare the stake in such a cause is almost inconceivable when a way could be found for recantation and reconciliation. The most probable explanation is that those who were burnt alive were relapsed heretics—penitents who had abjured and been reconciled and had subsequently returned to their errors, for whom under the canon law there was no mercy. The effigies can be readily understood, for their originals were either fugitives or dead, and thus unable to recant and abjure, a condition which led inevitably to comburation.

The errors ascribed to all these unfortunates may have been

[1] MSS. of Bodleian Library, Arch Seld A. Subt. 11.—Arch Seld. 130. Villalpando's retraction will be found in the Appendix. It is a document of some interest as presenting in a compendious form the position taken by the Inquisition with respect to mysticism.

[2] Llorente, III. 464.—Llorente's assertion is confirmed by the account in Bernino (Historia di tutti l' Heresie, Venezia, 1717, IV. 613), who says: "Andrea Paceco, Supremo Inquisitore di quel Regno, ne condannò sessantasei proposizioni, e ne fece abbrugiar vivi sette ostinati seguaci, abbrustoliti più tosto che illuminati da quel fuoco." See also Terzago, Theologia Historico-Mystica, Venetiis, 1764, p. 6.

really entertained by them, but an uncomfortable feeling of doubt is suggested by a celebrated case which was under prosecution simultaneously by the Inquisition of Toledo. This is worthy of some consideration, not only on account of its remarkable vicissitudes and the widespread attention which it attracted at the time, but also because of the light which it throws on inquisitorial methods in attributing alumbrado errors to the victim and securing his condemnation. About the year 1620 a young lady of noble birth, Doña Teresa de Silva, then about 22 years of age, was placed under the spiritual direction of Fray Francisco García Calderón, a Benedictine of exalted reputation for piety and learning. He was somewhat given to mysticism, and when he was condemned in 1630, one of the crimes alleged against him was that he had entertained improper relations with a young beata whom he claimed to be a saint; that when she died he buried her with great solemnity, leaving a place beside her grave for himself and publishing many miracles performed by her; that in a few days he disinterred the body, clothed it in silk, and applied to the papal nuncio to have her canonized, presenting suborned witnesses to testify to lying miracles. The whole proceedings of the Inquisition in this case, however, are so distorted by a venomous desire to ruin all the accused that we may safely assume there was nothing in this more extravagant than what was occurring almost daily throughout Spain. Calderón may have been a man whose zeal sometimes outran his discretion, but all the accessible documents in this case leave the impression that he was pure-minded, pious, and of exceptional force of character.

Doña Teresa also had mystical tendencies, doubtless increased by infirm health, for she seems to have been a chronic dyspeptic and subject to frequent illness, rendering her an easy prey to disordered nervous action. She early gained the reputation of being gifted with supernatural powers—an easy thing when everyone was eager to discern a miracle in the veriest trifle and to exaggerate it to the utmost. On her

trial it was made a crime to her that she claimed prophetic insight. Once, when dangerously sick, she told her confessor that she had a revelation that she would get well, but she trusted it so little that she received the viaticum. On her recovery the confessor talked of it as a prophecy and it was so received. So when she learned that Philip IV. was going to grant her permission to found a convent she told her confessor and he repeated it everywhere. When the permission came, everyone pronounced it a miracle. All this seems too trivial to repeat, but it illustrates the mental condition of the period and it became a serious matter in the skilful hands of the inquisitors.

After she had been under Calderón's guidance for four years her religious aspirations led her to enter the time-honored Benedictine Order. The Inquisition charged him with having persuaded her to break off a match arranged for her with a *caballero* and to become a nun, by promising that through her the honor of God would be restored, but her antecedents would seem to have led directly to this result without requiring impulsion from him. Her family must have assented willingly, for they furnished money towards founding a convent for her, and funds were also contributed by Don Jerónimo de Villanueva, Marquis of Villalba and Prothonotary, or Secretary of State, of Aragon, a favorite of the all-powerful royal favorite the Count-Duke Olivares. The convent was established in the parish of St. Martin, Madrid, under the name of *La Encarnacion bendita de San Plácido,* and its special object was to restore the rigid observance of the Rule of St. Benedict, which had become greatly relaxed, in the hope that it would lead to a reformation such as that wrought among the Carmelites by Santa Teresa and among the Franciscans by San Pedro de Alcántara. Thirty women entered it, Doña Teresa was elected abbess and Fray Calderón was made prior, confessor and spiritual father. We can imagine the spiritual tension in this little community of thirty women thus thrown together and subjected to the rigors of monastic

life under the exacting and stimulating direction of a man like Calderón, who hoped through them to work a reformation in his Order, and we can see that nervous disorders were inevitable if any of weaker temperament should find their ardor exhausted and cherish vain regret for the world which they had forever abandoned. It is not strange therefore that their first Christmas solemnities should have been disturbed by a violent hysterical attack suffered by a nun, who threw down the sacred images and cast the relics on the pavement. Presuming her insane a physician was summoned who after two days' attendance pronounced that her lucid intervals showed the trouble not to be natural, that she was a demoniac and required exorcisms, not drugs. Calderón had the reputation of a successful exorcist, and his experienced eye soon recognized that it was a case of diabolical possession, but his efforts were in vain. The new convent had already quarrelled with the monks of St. Martin, and Teresa called in the Abbot of Ripel, a learned and holy man, who could only confirm the fact. The trouble was not to stop there. The contagiousness of these nervous affections is well known, and it is not surprising that before long two other nuns were similarly attacked. Teresa was in despair; she had pictured to herself that her convent was to be a heaven on earth, and she saw the demon revelling in it and mocking all pious efforts for his expulsion. A tougher and less emotional temperament than hers, and a body less frail, would have been required to enable her to bear up against this wreck of all her hopes and the daily anxieties of her position. She felt her own brain giving way and resolutely struggled to retain self-control. Calderón for some time wisely refused to exorcise her, for fear of aggravating her symptoms and verifying her apprehensions, but finally he yielded and the natural result followed. On the feast of Nuestra Señora de la O (December 18) he wrapped a stole around her neck and proceeded with appropriate exorcisms. For a moment she felt relieved and was congratulating herself, when like a flash she lost all

control of herself and was wildly gesticulating and uttering incomprehensible follies. A particle of the true cross placed on her head oppressed her, she said, as though it were a tower. She was fairly in the hands of the demon, and her restraining influence being withdrawn the contagion spread until twenty-five of the thirty inmates were affected. The condition of the unfortunate community can be readily imagined, with only five nuns in possession of their senses and the rest performing all manner of crazy freaks—standing in the snow, barefooted and bareheaded, threatening to throw themselves down stairs, their bodies at one time appearing so heavy that they could scarce be moved, at others so light that they seemed able to fly, kneeling with arms outstretched for many hours at a time or pouring out endless cries and streams of words as the demons might dictate.

The presiding spirit of this pandemonium was named Peregrino. He attached himself especially to Teresa and his subordinates attended to the nuns. His utterances were varied; at the bidding of God he often gave sound Christian and moral instruction, and the Abbot of Ripel suggested that everything be taken down in writing. Fray Calderón assented and with infinite pains the wild talk of the demoniacs was committed to paper until a volume of six hundred pages was accumulated. This proved one of the most formidable evidences for the prosecution. Mingled with much eloquent Christian doctrine there were passages liable to perilous misconstruction. In one, Calderón, Teresa and another person were assimilated to Jesus, the Virgin and Joseph. Then there was talk of an apostolate of eleven nuns designated from among them to work a reformation in the Benedictine Order, developing into a second redemption of mankind. Even more dangerous were some prophecies as to the death of the pope, the succession of a cardinal who was a friend of Calderón, and the final elevation of the latter to the Holy See. Calderón disputed with Peregrino on these points and refused to believe them, but the demon attested that he

was compelled by God, much against his will, to reveal them, and proved his veracity by taking up a reliquary and handing it to Calderón; as the latter delayed to receive it, he dropped it, saying that it hurt him. Teresa, when sane, carefully abstained from asking questions of the demons, but Calderón was less prudent and, in his anxiety to probe the matter to the bottom and to obtain knowledge of the spiritual world, he did not hesitate to interrogate them and on one occasion he even made them draw pictures of angels and designate them by name.

His duty to the afflicted community led to another imprudence, for he could not minister to the hysteric nuns through the grille which was the established mode of communication, but he had to be much in the interior of the convent and even sometimes to eat there. Teresa declared that while he was always kind and courteous there never was the slightest approach to familiarity and that as spiritual director he was excessively rigid. Yet this breach of the rules gave occasion to accusations of alumbrado impurity which it was not easy to refute. One curious exhibition of what might be construed as affection she admitted—that several times when he was eating there she asked him for morsels which he had bitten off and which she swallowed; but this she explained by saying that every mouthful gave her fearful gastric pains; she thought that what had been in the mouth of so holy a person might digest more easily, and her strong faith made her find this to be the case.

Teresa was also accused of seeking the reputation of a saint by pretending to live without eating. This arose from a characteristic incident. The Count-Duke Olivares was childless and was exceedingly desirous to have an heir. Teresa, who had for some months been relieved from her demon, imagined that she had a revelation from God that his wishes would be gratified through the intercession of St. Benedict, and mentioned it to her confessor, who repeated it. Olivares came to see her several times to request her prayers, and in

her enthusiasm she asked God to inflict on her an illness if he would in return grant a child to the count-duke. The first part of her proposal was accepted. She was speedily seized with excessive and prolonged vomiting; for nearly a month her stomach would retain nothing and for a considerable time her life was despaired of. The affair excited much attention; it was confidently expected that the desires of Olivares would be gratified, and when this proved to be fallacious it can readily be imagined that Teresa would be ridiculed and her sufferings be pronounced an imposture.

For three years the convent of San Plácido continued to be thus vexed by the demoniacal possession of the nuns which kept it in an uproar day and night. Calderón's efforts proved fruitless; in spite of him the demons held high carnival in the house of God and the impression got abroad that there must be something wrong at the bottom of the mystery. Advantage was taken of this by Fray Alonso de Leon, who had been a friend of Calderón but who had quarrelled with him, to denounce him and the nuns to the Inquisition. Two Trinitarian friars were sent to investigate, and on their report Don Diego Serrano was appointed commissioner to prepare a prosecution. Fray Alonso won him over and pushed the affair to the utmost. Two or three of the nuns, known to be hostile to Teresa, were examined and orders were given to arrest all concerned. Calderón had wind of it and endeavored to escape to France but was seized at Gerona, and in 1628 he, Teresa, and the nuns were all immured in the *carceles secretas* of the Inquisition of Toledo. Here every method that craft and force could devise was employed to secure condemnation. Calderón was thrice subjected to the most cruel torture (*tres fieros tormentos*) but no confession of error or of wrong-doing could be extorted from his unyielding firmness. He persistently asserted that the convent of San Plácido was a holy spot and that the demoniacal possession of the nuns was miraculous. It was otherwise with the frightened women. Solitude, confinement, and the awful dread

overhanging them rendered them facile witnesses. As Teresa says, God only knew what they suffered in prison; no one else in fact could know, for inquisitorial secrecy was inviolable. When the evidence was not acceptable to the prosecution it was perverted and falsified on the record, and when this was read over to the witnesses, and they protested that it was not correct, they were told that it was all the same and that they must ratify it. Teresa, in her subsequent memorial to the Supreme Council, does not hesitate to say that Satan himself could not have distorted it with more malicious venom. How easy it was to convert the most innocent expressions into alumbrado doctrines is seen in the use made of her statement that when in sacramental confession to Calderón she would hesitate and say she was ashamed to confess, he would tell her that one who lived in charity should feel no shame in confessing; also that when there were quarrels between the nuns he would quote St. Paul to them, that charity suffers all things. On this was founded a charge that he taught the forbidden tenets that charity superseded shame and that filthiness of living was mystic union. If this was the way in which Teresa's evidence was handled we can imagine what was done with that of the other nuns, especially of those who were inimical to Calderón. Nor was this all. When the testimony was laid before the *calificadores* or theologians who were to decide upon it, it was garbled and only the incriminating portions were allowed to reach them. In the profound secrecy which enveloped every act of the Inquisition all this was easily possible in every case and it is only the peculiarity of the present one, in its subsequent reopening, that reveals to us the fact.

The result so carefully prepared was inevitable. On April 27, 1630, an *auto particular* was held in the hall of the Toledan Inquisition. The imperturbable Fray Calderón was brought forward—in the words of an eye-witness, as smiling and contented as though he were about to receive a cardinal's hat—and his only remark was one of surprise at seeing a

hundred and fifty or two hundred notables of the city assembled, for he had been told that the affair was to be private. The sentence, containing a recital of the offences proved against him, occupied two hours in the reading, during which he remained impassible. He was convicted of the ordinary so-called alumbrado errors; his relations with the deceased beata were described as disgusting; when the demoniacal possession appeared in San Plácido he asserted that the more who suffered from it the greater was the sign of God's favor, and that through them the whole church would be reformed; he kept the Eucharist in a room where they took it in their mouths and prophesied, and these prophecies he carefully wrote out and preserved; the reformation of the Church was to be wrought by eleven of them as apostles—eleven being selected in order that Judas might not be represented; the reigning pope would soon die and be succeeded by a cardinal who was his special friend and would give him the cardinalate that he might follow in the papacy. He had also endeavored for a long while to persuade a young lady to abandon herself to him, assuring her that she would give birth to a child who would conquer the Holy Land, transfer the papacy to Jerusalem and from there as pope govern the world. His offences had been heightened by his obstinate refusal to confess his guilt, and if the tribunal really believed all this farrago it was justified in its customary boast of mercy. He was required to abjure *de vehementi;* he was to be taken to a convent of his Order in Valladolid where his sentence was to be read in presence of the assembled monks and he was to undergo a "circular" scourging by them all; then to be conveyed to the convent designated for his confinement, where the same ceremony was to be performed, including the scourging; he was then to be immured for life in a cell, to be deprived of all priestly functions, to fast three days in the week and to receive the sacrament only at Easter, Pentecost, and Christmas. His sentence was also to be read in San Plácido before the nuns who apparently had by that time

been replaced there. During all this he manifested no emotion and merely swore to comply with the sentence and penance.

Doña Teresa's fate was less harsh. She was relegated to another convent for four years; for four years more she was deprived of the right to vote and for ten years of eligibility to be voted for. The nuns were to be scattered around separately in different convents.

Alonso de Leon and Diego Serrano had accomplished their object. Calderón was destroyed, Doña Teresa was rendered little less than infamous, and the house of San Plácido was broken up—all for the honor of God and the vindication of the faith. The thing was apparently irrevocable, for no one could conceive of so unexampled an act as an acknowledgment by the Inquisition of its own fallibility. Teresa however submitted to her penance with such sweetness and humility as to convince her superiors of her innocent piety. The honor of the great Benedictine Order was at stake and, more than all, the Prothonotary of Aragon enlisted the favorite Olivares in behalf of his protégées. With the lapse of years these forces gathered strength, and in 1637, by command of her superiors, Teresa presented to the Supreme Council of the Inquisition a formal appeal against the injustice of her sentence. The procurator general of her Order, Fray Gabriel de Bustamente, prosecuted the matter officially. The Supreme Council consented to reopen it and laid the case before ten more *calificadores* of the highest reputation for learning and wisdom, who reported in 1638 that the sentence of Teresa and the nuns was uncalled for, though they were careful to add that if they had had to decide on the evidence laid before their predecessors they would have agreed with them. In conformity with this a solemn act was published pronouncing the sentence null and void, rehabilitating the nuns and releasing them from all penances imposed on them. No allusion was made to the unhappy Calderón, who had doubtless perished long before in his solitary cell. The con-

vent of San Plácido was re-established and in 1641 we hear of a new building commenced for it by the Prothonotary, the corner stone of which was laid with much ceremony.

Yet the vicissitudes of this extraordinary affair were not quite over. Early in 1643 Olivares was driven from power and the Prothonotary shared his disgrace. The Inquisitor General Sotomayor had not relished the pressure which had forced him tardily to undo an injustice, and as soon as the royal favorite was removed he took steps to wipe out the stigma inflicted on the Holy Office. In spite of the general adverse comment excited by his action, he reopened the case and in August, 1643, committed its prosecution to the Bishop of Plasencia, Arce y Reynoso, who was an inquisitor. The latter however was intriguing to supplant his superior which he speedily succeeded in doing. With the dismissal of Sotomayor affairs took a more favorable turn for the persecuted nuns. In December we hear of their petitioning the queen that the case might be dropped and her consulting the Dominican Tapia, Bishop of Segovia, who reported that as the nuns were quiet and leading a decorously religious life it would be well to leave them in peace. Yet in the following April Arce y Reynoso was talking of reopening the matter and when on August 31, 1644, the Prothonotary was arrested by the Inquisition it was currently reported that Teresa and three of her nuns had also been seized. Though the prosecution of the Prothonotary was in reality purely a political matter, when his sentence was rendered by the tribunal of Toledo in 1647, one of the clauses orders him to have nothing to do with the nuns of San Plácido and forbids him to inhabit a house which he had built adjoining the convent.[1]

[1] The material for the inside history of this celebrated case is mostly to be found in the appeal of Doña Teresa (MSS. of the Biblioteca Nacional of Madrid, S. 294 fol. 387). There is a copy of the sentence of Calderón in the MSS. of the Bodleian Library, Arch Seld. A. Subt. 11. Another, apparently taken down by an eyewitness, and embracing a copy of the act of rehabilitation, is in the same library, Arch Seld. 130. A *Breve Relacion* of the *auto de*

Under the steady repression of the Holy Office pure religious mysticism rapidly declined in Spain. The great mystics of the sixteenth century, whose writings were translated into all the languages of the Roman obedience, and who seemed at one time as if they might found a school destined in its development to revolutionize the Church, had a constantly diminishing number of imitators. Yet in spite of the Inquisition, the beliefs on which mysticism was based continued to flourish and found an occasional expositor. In 1632, Madre Isabel de la Cruz, of Jerez de los Caballeros, commonly known as the Beata de Soto, commenced to suffer the agonies of the Passion of Christ, which never ceased until she passed away in 1681. She would in contemplation set before her some incident of the Passion, desiring to share the sufferings of her beloved spouse, when they would be repeated in her. Thus in 1632 she had a vision of Christ dragged to Calvary; then Christ disappeared and she found herself in his place. When she recovered from the trance she had a welt around her neck as though it had been tightly compressed with a halter, and this remained until her death, always paining sharply. Once in the street Christ signified to her that he

fé, drawn up on the day of occurrence, is in the Bodleian, $\frac{4583}{112}$, and another copy in the Bibliothèque Nationale of Paris, fonds Dupuy 15, fol. 158. This is not wholly correct in all details, but I print it in the Appendix.

The allusions to the subsequent proceedings are found in the *Cartas de Jesuitas*, printed in the *Memorial Histórico Español*, T. XVII. 172, 355, 395, XVIII. 474, and in the *Avisos Históricos* of Pellicer (Valladares, Semanario erúdito, T. XXXII. 137, 242; XXXIII. 169, 225.

I do not understand why Llorente (III. 486) and Menendez y Pelayo (II. 556) place the date of the sentence in 1633, and Llorente that of the rehabilitation in 1642. Teresa in her appeal expressly says that the sentence was rendered in 1630, and the Bodleian MS. $\frac{4583}{112}$, gives the date of the *auto* as Saturday, April 27, 1630, a year in which Saturday fell on April 27. The act of rehabilitation is dated 1638, and a Jesuit writing on October 22 of that year announces its issue to his correspondent with the suggestive remark, *Grande es la potencia del Protonotario* (Mem. Hist. Esp. XV. 82).

It is scarce necessary to call attention to the similarity of the cases of Calderón and of Urbain Grandier, which were so nearly synchronous (Histoire des Diables de Loudun, Amsterdam, 1752).

wished her to share his cup. She assented and instantly was seized with agonies through her whole frame and was carried to a house where she lay for nineteen hours. Her hands and feet and side and head suffered with especial acuteness as though she were on the cross and showed red and livid marks which disappeared as she recovered. Finally the stigmata became permanent and her sufferings grew more acute as she advanced in years. On March 10, 1568, she again saw Christ carrying the cross, when she begged him to let her share it and he touched her shoulder with it; intolerable pains immediately seized the arm which remained permanently bent and crippled. It was evidently a well-marked case of hysteria and neuralgia developing under the mystical tendencies of the period, but she was looked upon with veneration by the people, and her obsequies in 1681 were celebrated as a great religious ceremony. Yet her life by Fray Juan Molano de S. Vicente was prohibited by the Inquisition in 1777.[1]

A more worthy representative of the great mystics was the Venerable Palafox y Mendoza, Bishop of Puebla and of Osma, who in spite of his active and stirring life and practical vigor had the mystic temperament strongly developed, as shown in his commentaries on the letters of Santa Teresa and other works, especially his *Luz á los Vivos y escarmiento en los Muertos*—a compilation of stories concerning purgatory drawn from some four hundred visions of Madre Francisca del Sacratisimo Sacramento, who died in 1628. He was an adept in the dangerous raptures of *recojimiento*, where the soul gazes upon God in his glory, loses all its faculties and is united with its Creator in a delirium of divine love.[2]

[1] Barrantes, Aparato para la Historia de Extremadura II. 319-23.—Índice Último, p. 276.

[2] "Y yendo sin camino,
sin que haya entendimiento ni memoria,
le muestre el Rey Divino
su virtud y su gloria
como se puede en vida transitoria.

"O noche cristallina
que juntaste con essa luz hermosa
en un union divina
al Esposo y su Esposa
haciendo ambos una misma cosa."
—Palafox, Obras, VII. 543.

It is observable that this passage comprises two or three of the propositions

His voluminous works were composed with a rapidity which he himself ascribed to inspiration. He describes himself as habitually writing with an image of the Christ-child or of the Virgin before him and as wondering whence came the thoughts which crowded themselves to his pen with a swiftness almost supernatural. He wrote weeping or burning with holy tenderness, and when he had finished he could scarce read what the Spirit had dictated to him—*lo que el espiritu le dictaba*.[1] Yet though he was persecuted by the Inquisition it was not, as Llorente asserts, on account of Illuminism,[2] but simply because, in his quarrel with the Jesuits, the latter's alliance with the Holy Office enabled them to use it as a convenient instrument.

It was impossible that the Inquisition could eradicate the superstitions connected with mysticism when they were shared and patronized by the throne to an extent which contributed to the rapid degradation in the seventeenth century of the all-powerful kingdom of Charles V. The most extraordinary illustration of this is furnished by the relations between Philip IV. and Madre María de Jesus, commonly known as María de Agreda, superior of the Franciscan convent of Agreda in Aragon. At the age of eight María had made a vow of virginity and she practised mental prayer as soon as she could use her reason. In 1620, when eighteen years old, she commenced to have ecstasies which became almost perpetual for three years, when at her prayer God relieved her from them. She was in constant communication with God, the Virgin and the angels, and so great was her ardor of divine love that at times her under garments would be scorched.[3] Her

condemned in the Edict of Pacheco. Yet Palafox's works, when diligently scrutinized in Rome during the canonization proceedings, were pronounced wholly unobjectionable.

[1] Vida interior, cap. xxiv. No. 1; cap. liii. No. 1, 2 (Obras, I. 79, 230).

[2] Llorente, III. 125.

[3] Vita Ven. Mariæ de Agreda, §§ 4, 6, 8, 13, 38.—Præfat. ad Lib. I. Vitæ B. Virginis.

fame filled the land, and her voluminous writings, which claim to be inspired, still form part of the devotional literature of Spain, Portugal and Germany.

When, in 1643, Philip IV. in despair abandoned the delights of Buen Retiro to approach the seat of war in Catalonia, he had, as he wrote to Madre Agreda, no human resources, and he relied wholly on divine ones. He gives us a curious insight into the Spanish statesmanship of the period when he confesses his perplexities over revelations brought to him by monks, commanding him to punish certain persons and to dismiss others from his service. This matter of revelations, he says, is one which deserves much care, especially when the monks bring them against those who have always proved faithful and in favor of those of bad reputation.[1] To this had come the successor of Ferdinand and Charles V. and Philip II., and the mystic might well regard himself as supreme when the destinies of the land might depend upon his fables. Philip's resource was to appeal to another mystic; when he reached Aragon he paid Madre María a visit and she seems to have mingled some good counsel with her spiritual exhortations. If she attributed the national misfortunes in part to the wrath of heaven at the fashionable garments of the period and urged Philip, when he should reach Saragossa, to put the kingdom in the hands of Our Lady del Pilar, making her its mistress, protectress, advocate and defender, she also warned him to curb the petulance of his courtiers, to be careful in the selection of his ministers and favorites, to protect the poor, to administer equal justice, and she also hinted at the necessity of regular pay for the troops. She was rapidly becoming a power in the state, and those who hoped for the favor of the monarch found it advisable to cultivate her good

[1] Ochoa, Epistolario Español, II. 79-81.—Visions enjoyed by Don Francisco de Chiribaga contributed to the fall of Olivares, and the Jesuit Padre Galindo, who was concerned in the matter, suffered imprisonment for acting without asking permission from his superiors.—Pellicer, Avisos históricos (Valladares, Semanario erudito, T. XXXIII. p. 171).

opinion. As for Philip, when his army was besieging Monçon, he wrote to her, November 10, that everything depended on the result; if the enemy should succeed in relieving the place the kingdom would be lost, and in this strait he knows of nothing better than to ask her to redouble her exercises and prayers. For twenty-two years, until his death in 1665, he kept up an assiduous correspondence with her, sending a letter by every post written on half the sheet of paper and requiring her to return it with her answer on the blank portion—a simple device which was easily eluded for, at the command of her confessor, she kept copies of the royal epistles and of her replies.[1]

The writings and the canonization proceedings of Madre Agreda furnish another illustration of the difficulty of discriminating in these matters between heresy and sanctity. The writings professed to be divine revelations, but her *Letania y nombres misteriosos de la Reina del Cielo* and her *Mistica Ciudad de Dios* were condemned in Rome in 1681, though the prohibition of the latter was for a time suspended at the instance of the Spanish court and it did not appear until the issue, in 1692, of the Appendix to the Index of Innocent XI.[2] In spite of this the latter work was formally permitted by the Spanish Inquisition; it was translated by Père Thomas Croset, and published in France in 1695, when the Sorbonne promptly fell foul of it and by decree of September 27, 1696, condemned it as containing fables and dreams which exposed Catholicism to the contempt of the heretics.[3] Owing to the earnest efforts of the Spanish court the prohibition was again suspended, and though an Italian translation

[1] Ochoa, Epistolario Español, II. 79-81.—Vita Ven. Mariæ de Agreda, § 29.

[2] Index Libb. Prohibb. Innocent. PP. XI. p. 167; Append. p. 41.—Reusch, Der Index, II. 253.

[3] D'Argentré, Collect. Judic. de novis Erroribus, III. 1. 156. Fourteen propositions extracted from the book were characterized as "Hæ omnes propositiones respective temerariæ sunt et contra ecclesiasticæ regulæ modestiam assertæ; pleræque fabulas et somnia Apocryphorum redolent et religionem Catholicam impiorum et hæreticorum contemptui exponunt."

was published at Trent in 1714, the book disappears from the 1716 Index of Clement XI. which was followed by the appearance of a Latin version at Vienna in 1719.[1] The subject was again taken up in 1729 and after a long debate the book was permitted.[2] Although the learned Dr. Eusebius Amort tells us that, in 1735, when in Rome he was shown a recent decree of Benedict XIII. renewing the prohibition and asserting that its withdrawal had been obtained by fraudulent means, still it never reappears upon the Index.[3] The condemnation of the *Letania* lasted longer; it is contained in the 1716 Index of Clement XI. and the first Index of Benedict XIV. in 1744, but disappears in the revision of 1758.[4]

All this and the struggle over her canonization were part of the deadly quarrel between the Dominicans and the rest of the Church on the subject of the Immaculate Conception. The revelations of Madre Agreda were directed to exalting the position of the Virgin and to proving her freedom from original sin. The *Plomos del Sacromonte* and the false Chronicle of Dexter were freely drawn upon to show the Virgin's headship of the apostolic Church, and the wildest extravagances were poured forth in the *Mistica Ciudad*. At the very moment of her conception the Virgin had an infused knowledge of everything, natural and supernatural, greater than all creatures have acquired or will acquire through eternity. At that same moment she made a genuflection to God and prayed for mankind, and her act was of greater worth than all that the saints have done. At the Crucifixion she

[1] Analecta Franciscana, T. I. p. 92.

[2] Reusch, Der Index, II. 256.

[3] Amort, De Revelationibus etc. Regulæ tutæ, P. II. p. 220 (August. Vindel. 1744).

A new translation of the *Mistica Ciudad* appeared at Ratisbon so recently as 1887.

[4] Index Clementis PP. XI., p. 292.—Index Bened. PP. XIV. 1744, p. 313.

Caietano Marcecalea in his *Enchiridion Mysticum* (Verona, 1766) gives two lists of mystic books, one recommended and the other prohibited, and it is significant that the writings of María de Agreda find place in neither.

ordered the sun, moon and stars to stand still and they obeyed. To the *Mistica Ciudad* Amort devotes nearly four hundred pages of his work *De Revelationibus*, exposing its innumerable blunders in history, chronology, geography, anatomy, physiology and even in matters of faith and theology, as, for instance, her approach to the errors attributed to Molinos in teaching that all sins are forgiven through obedience, whence he concludes that her revelations were illusory and probably suggested by the demon.[1]

The effort to obtain her canonization has continued at intervals since her death in 1665. In 1673 the Congregation of Rites agreed to commence the proceedings.[2] In 1735 Amort tells us that he read the papers of the process in Rome.[3] It was earnestly pushed under Benedict XIV. who submitted the *Mistica Ciudad* to a commission of four cardinals and four theologians, and on their adverse decision by a vote of five to three, in 1748, he postponed further action and left a secret document in the archives of the castle of Sant' Angelo to warn his successors against approving a work which had been formally condemned and was based on the apocryphal gospels condemned by Gelasius I. Clement XIV. had another struggle with it, but the papers of Benedict XIV.'s commission were brought to light and Clement, by decree of April 27, 1773, confirmed his predecessor's action and forbade all future proceedings in the matter. He also notified the Spanish ambassador that this involved the renewal of the prohibition of her book, but that out of respect to the king of

[1] Amort, *op. cit.* P. II. pp. 257, 274, 399.—Curiously enough, María revived a portion of an old heresy by describing Christ's conception from three drops of the Virgin's purest blood (Amort, p. 299). When Piero da Lucca enunciated this in 1504, with the addition that the place of conception was the Virgin's heart, he came near being burnt, and his theory was condemned in a solemn assembly convoked by Julius II. (Ripoll, Bullar. Ord. FF. Prædic. IV. 267.—D'Argentré, Collect. Judic. I. II. 347).

[2] Reusch, Der Index, II. 253.

[3] Amort, P. II. p. 218.

Spain he would abstain from it.[1] Still the Spaniards did not lose hope and made another fruitless attempt under his successor Pius VI.[2] In 1825 Leo XII. positively refused an application to authorize a new French translation of the *Mistica Ciudad*, and, even after the definition of the Immaculate Conception as an article of faith by Pius IX., that pope confirmed a decree of the Congregation of the Index in 1866 ordering its secretary, in reply to inquiries, to declare that the work was prohibited. Yet in 1867 Isabel II. and thirty-eight Spanish bishops petitioned Pius to reopen the case. He decided that the *Mistica Ciudad* could not again be examined, but he ordered a secret investigation of a miracle alleged to have recently occurred in Belgium, in which a sick nun was cured by the intercession of María de Jesus. A Roman physician, Dr. Adriano Officini, was despatched thither, but it was not until March 2, 1884, that he reported the recovery to have been undoubtedly miraculous. Meanwhile in 1880 the Cardinal Archbishop of Toledo, followed by fifty-eight bishops and other dignitaries, had petitioned Leo XIII. on the subject, and on March 10, 1884, he ordered the Congregation of Rites secretly to consider whether the prohibition of Clement XIV. could be removed. To suggest such a dis-

[1] See an interesting analysis of the report of the *Promotor fidei* in the case, made in 1885, published in the Deutscher Merkur, 21, 28 Dez. 1889, pp. 302, 314.

In connection with this I may call attention to the visions of Anna Katerina Emmerich, who died in 1824, which are of the same nature as those of Madre Agreda, and like them based on the Apocryphal Gospels. According to Benedict XIV. this is enough to condemn them, but so far from being placed on the Index they have been carefully collected, put in narrative form, and published *cum permissu superiorum* as a book of popular edification, forming a curious illustration of existing beliefs (Visions d'Anne Catherine Emmerich, coordonnées par le R. P. Fr. Joseph Alvare Ðuley, Paris, 1864). Thus the heresy of one age becomes the accepted doctrine of another. Cf. Epiphanii Panar. Hæres. LXXIX.

[2] In 1776 we find Fray Joaquin Eleta, confessor of Carlos III., writing to Count Floridablanca, the ambassador at Rome, complaining of delay and insinuating that Floridablanca is lukewarm in the matter (Ochoa, Epistolario Español, II. 211).

cussion is almost equivalent to deciding it in the affirmative, and it will be curious to observe whether eventually the formal decisions of so many popes will be set aside by enrolling María in the catalogue of saints, involving the recognition of her condemned book as an undoubted revelation from God.[1]

In spite of such cases as those of Isabel de la Cruz and Madre Agreda the Spanish atmosphere continued unfavorable to mysticism. Miguel de Molinos found it advisable to transfer his propagandist labors to the more congenial climate of Rome. His remarkable case, in which the Jesuits succeeded in reversing the immemorial attitude of the Church, does not come within my present limits, but I may call attention to the significance of the fact that his *Guida Spirituale*, which, on its appearance in 1675, enjoyed the special favor and approbation of Innocent XI., was promptly condemned in Spain in 1677, on the publication of a Spanish version at Saragossa, eight years before proceedings were commenced in Rome against its author, and that the Roman Inquisition took amiss this independent action of the Spanish Holy Office.[2] It is also worthy of remark that, after the Spanish views had received the Apostolic confirmation in the condemnation of Molinos, we hear but little of Alumbrados, whose place is taken by Molinistas. The old heresy was conveniently assumed to be a new one which had been stamped with reprobation by the Church Universal.

[1] Deutscher Merkur, *loc. cit.* It is quite possible, however, that the revelation in the *Merkur* of the secret history of the affair may prove fatal to the hopes of the advocates of canonization.

[2] Reusch, Der Index, II. 615.—The reader can find a compendious account of the very curious case of Molinos in the little work of Mr. John Bigelow, "Molinos the Quietist," New York, 1882.

IMPOSTORS.

The influences which we have been considering had naturally led to a vast development of the trade of exploiting popular credulity with trances and revelations. For convenience' sake I class these under the general head of impostures, because the Inquisition, when it saw fit to investigate and punish the performers, adopted the general term of *embusteros* to characterize them. Many of the cases, however, which we shall have to review were doubtless only hysterical self-deception, and when the Inquisition let them alone they left behind them the memory of saintly virtues rewarded with special divine graces which long preserved for them the popular veneration enjoyed during life.

In investigating this phase of the subject it is necessary to premise that one of the principal dangers to which the mystics were exposed was that the demon was vigilantly on the watch to deceive them. He brought them visions and revelations, he gave them limited prophetic and miraculous powers, and he deceived them into believing that these were gifts of God to reward their devotional exercises. This had long been recognized as one of the most treacherous pitfalls in the perilous paths of illumination and union. In the twelfth century Richard de Saint-Victor exhorts his disciples to beware of it.[1] In the thirteenth, St. Thomas Aquinas points out that trances come from three sources—from God, from the demon, and from bodily affections.[2] In the fifteenth, Gerson wrote a treatise to point out the methods of differentiation.[3] The Blessed Juan de Ávila is very emphatic in his

[1] Rich. S. Victoris Benjaminis Minoris c. lxxxi.

[2] S. Th. Aquin. Summ. Sec. Sec. Q. clxxv. Art. 1.

[3] Gersoni Tract. de distinctione verarum visionum a falsis (Opp. 1494. T. I. xix. L.).

warning to the devout to beware of such deceptions; he admits the difficulty of distinguishing between these demonic illusions and the real effects of divine grace, while the tests which he supplies only serve to show the impossibility of arriving at certainty in the analysis.[1] The daily business of the Inquisition brought the subject constantly before it and the effort was repeatedly made to establish rules for safe guidance; the rules were clear enough but the difficulty lay in their application.[2] The same may be said of those engaged in the more weighty affair of deciding on beatification and canonization.[3] In the investigation of these cases there was thus a quadruple question to be solved by the Inquisition—whether the manifestations which excited popular reverence were really from God, whether they were honestly believed by the devotee while in reality the work of Satan, whether

[1] B. Juan de Ávila, "Audi Filia et Vide," cap. li.-lv.

[2] Simancæ de Cathol. Institt. Tit. xxi.—Ant. de Sousa Aphorismi Inquisit. Lib. I. c. xxxix. No. 5 *sqq.*—Alberghini Manuale Qualificatorum S. Inquisit cap. xli.

[3] Benedicti PP. XIV. De Servorum Dei Beatificatione Lib. III. c. 49, 50, 51. Amort finally, after the Church had definitely set its face against the extravagances of mysticism, in his learned work on the subject, sums up that the first rule to be observed is that no revelation by a woman is to be received without positive external proof, and he adds that as extremely few present these proofs extremely few are to be accepted. He proceeds to enumerate the signs which were commonly received, and to reject them one by one, as explicable either by natural causes or by operation of the demon, such as visions of Christ or of God, prophecies of the future, even if verified by the event, reading the thoughts of others, ecstasies even when accompanied by elevation from the ground, union with God, floods of pure devotional feeling, inexplicable internal peace and blessedness, a more accurate knowledge of divine mysteries than is possible through the unassisted light of faith, the working of miracles such as curing the sick or inflicting disease on unbelievers, transferring bodies from place to place, arousing love or hatred. Even if a revelation is from God, he argues that there can be no certainty that it is not falsified by the operation of the fancy or the work of the demon. —Amort de Revelationibus, etc. P. I. pp. 259-68.

It will be seen how difficult was the position of the Church, committed to the belief in special manifestations of supernatural power and utterly unable to determine whether they came from above or below.

they were known to him to be demonic, or whether, in fine, they were simply fraudulent speculations on popular superstition. When the latter could not be proved, demonic agency was a convenient explanation to adopt in carrying out the policy of suppressing the development of mysticism.

While the Beata of Piedrahita was exciting veneration with her courtesies to the Virgin, another and more consummate practitioner was in training for a longer and more conspicuous career. Magdalena de la Cruz was born about 1487 of poor parents in Aguilar. She seems to have been a child of hysterical temperament and precociously nervous development. In her confession before the Inquisition she relates that when four years old the Virgin appeared to her and revealed to her all the secrets of the birth and life and death of Christ; that at five she had visions of Christ and sought to imitate the crucifixion by nailing herself to the wall, when she fell and broke two ribs. Soon after, in another vision of Christ crucified, he granted her the grace of perpetual virginity, and as a visible sign pressed her two little fingers which never grew thereafter and scarcely reached the first joint of the third fingers. At twelve she made a pact of mutual service with a spirit whom she took to be an angel of light. About this time, on reading the life of St. Mary of Egypt, she was seized with the desire of retirement to a desert; she procured a male dress, left the house after midnight, and betook herself to a neighboring cave, but the same night she found herself transported back to her home without knowing how she got there. Her habitual condition of nervous exaltation was accompanied with the morbid desire to attract attention common in such cases, and this was stimulated by the ease with which popular superstition accepted and exaggerated miracles. On one occasion, while still living in her father's house, the sacrament was carried past it to a death-bed; she heard the accompanying bell and desired to see it, but the room had a blank wall; on searching she

found a crevice through which she peeped. This was regarded as a miracle, and the story grew until it became a universally accepted fact that, whenever the sacrament passed a house in which she was, the wall would open to give her a view of it. On another occasion, when she undertook the devotion of maintaining silence during Lent, an admirer sent her a collation from which she took a little bread and sent the rest back. The story got abroad that she had ceased to eat as well as to talk, and as this flattered her vanity she said it was so. Thus her natural temperament and the training of her early life fitted her for the extraordinary career which she was to follow for thirty-eight years, in which hysterical devotion and cunning combined to render her the admiration not only of Spain but of all Latin Christianity.

When therefore, in 1504, at the age of seventeen, she entered the Franciscan Order in the convent of Santa Isabel de los Ángeles of Córdoba she already had the reputation of a person singularly overflowing with divine grace. Her sister nuns were soon filled with admiration at her trances, in which she would hold conversations with the persons of the Trinity and with saints, and in one of which the experiment was tried of piercing the sole of a foot and an ankle without her shrinking. Visions of the Passion, in which the devotee suffered the agonies of Christ, were common enough among the mystics, but she invented a thoroughly original mode of union with the Redeemer. Earnestly desiring to enjoy the delight which the Virgin felt in giving birth to her divine Son, she was promised it by her attendant spirit. On the night of the feast of the Conception, December 8, her belly began to swell and so remained until the Nativity, when at midnight the tumescence disappeared and she held the Christ-child in her arms, covering him with her hair—hair which she afterwards found not to be her own and which was eagerly treasured as relics by those to whom she distributed it. On another occasion she accompanied the Holy Family in the Flight into Egypt, and in the morning she had a material

token of it in a thorn which had pierced her foot. That she should be favored with the stigmata was a matter of course, but a more striking manifestation of her sanctity was her living for eleven years with no food but the Eucharist. To accomplish this required accomplices who secretly supplied her; during the first seven years she subsisted on a little bread and water, but towards the end she indulged in a somewhat more varied diet. A sceptical prelate of her Order to test the miracle shut her in a cell and had the door walled up; at the end of the first twenty-four hours she was much exhausted, but during the second night she managed to escape through a window, and her explanation that she had been miraculously removed by St. Francis and St. Antony was accepted as satisfactory.

This shows that there were some doubters, and among them was Ignatius Loyola. In 1541 the Jesuit Martin de la Santa Cruz endeavored to win him over but received a severe reprimand for accepting exterior signs without seeking for the true ones. As a rule, however, every one was eager to be deceived, and the veriest trifles were eagerly reported as miracles. She sent some fish to a friend which were thought to be so savory that they must have come from the terrestrial paradise; she allowed the belief to exist and it rapidly expanded into a legend that Christ had carried her to the Jordan, where five fishing lines dropped from his five wounds and caught the fish. She was carrying some eggs in her sleeve when they fell out without breaking; this was at once pronounced a miracle and she encouraged it. A basket of cherries with some decayed ones at top was supposed to have become sound under her influence, and this was another miracle. The sick fancied themselves cured by her touch. It would have required the self-control of a saint not to encourage and speculate upon the universal eagerness to convert her simplest actions into manifestations of supernatural power.

There was in fact no limit to the exaggerations of popular

credulity. In 1525 she was said to have announced the battle of Pavia with the capture of Francis I. on the day of its occurrence and to have foretold the king's marriage with Leonora, sister of Charles V. She was also held to have predicted the result of an election to the generalate of the Order. She was eager to gain the reputation of a prophet and foretold that if a certain woman should marry she would die in her first confinement, basing her prediction on knowledge of a disease with which the person was afflicted. When she took the sacrament it was popularly believed that she was elevated from the ground and that the host leaped from the hand of the priest up into her mouth; also that when any one took communion in her presence a part of the Eucharist would be conveyed to her—a belief which she encouraged by carrying fragments of unconsecrated wafers, which she slipped into her mouth at the proper time. In her ecstasies she was reported to be lifted from the ground and clothed in living flame. She had been sanctified in her mother's womb and was incapable of sin. She could transport herself from place to place. Tempest-tossed mariners would invoke her protection, when she would appear to them and the storm would be lulled. These were not merely the superstitions of the vulgar; they were shared by all classes. The greatest ladies of the land when about to be confined would send to her the garments prepared for the expected child that she might bless them; before the birth of Philip II. in 1527 the Empress Isabel thus sent the *layette* from Valladolid to Córdoba, accompanying it with her portrait. When, in 1535, Charles V. was about to embark at Barcelona for the conquest of Tunis, he sent his banner to Córdoba with the same object. Cardinal Manrique, the inquisitor general, and Giovanni di Reggio, the papal nuncio, made pilgrimages to see her, and the pope sent to her to ask her prayers for the Christian republic.

Magdalena was amiable and charitable and generally beloved. In 1533 she was elected prioress of her convent, and

this was repeated in 1536 and 1539, but in 1542 she was defeated. While at its head she had devoted to it the large stream of offerings which poured in upon her and had almost wholly rebuilt the structure. When defeated she no longer made this use of the money and there was no further advantage to be gained from her. The party which had triumphed at the election reported to the provincial and to the guardian that she was an impostor, but they were not listened to. Faith in her was too deeply rooted to be easily overthrown and if she had been wholly depraved she might have died in the odor of sanctity and added another saint to the calendar. Towards the end of 1543 she fell dangerously sick; her case became apparently desperate and her physician warned her that she must prepare for the end. She had not resolution to keep up the deception, and she made a general confession of her long series of deceits, ascribing her perversion to demoniacal possession and requiring exorcism before she was able to speak.

Unfortunately for her she recovered and the Inquisition promptly claimed her. Her trial lasted until May 3, 1546, and an immense body of testimony was taken, although she at once confessed spontaneously. She threw the whole blame of her misguided life on a demon named Balban who had taken possession of her when a child; with the assistance of a comrade named Patorrio he had wrought all the wonders which had earned her reputation; they usually appeared to her in the shape of various saints, but sometimes as negroes or even as bulls or other animals. In the revulsion of popular feeling they were assumed to be her incubi, but there is no allusion to this in her confession and sentence. Her confession, in fact, is a very curious document. She explains her frauds with the utmost candor, she describes the wonders wrought for her by her familiar spirits, and at the same time speaks of many of her ecstasies and visions as absolute facts. She was doubtless a mystic, accustomed to all the spiritual exaltations characteristic of mysticism, who had been unable

to resist the temptation of feeding the popular appetite with the wonders which it so eagerly craved, and when led to confess she extenuated her aberrations by introducing somewhat clumsily demonic influence where it seemed necessary.

In selecting this line of defence her customary cunning had not deserted her. Despite her manifold offences, aggravated by her having had herself thrice baptized, the Inquisition treated her with remarkable leniency. Her age and infirmities, and the heartfelt contrition which she expressed, pleaded in her favor, and the tribunal announced as usual that it visited her with mercy rather than with rigor. At the auto in the Cathedral of Córdoba, on May 3, 1546, in the presence of an immense crowd, the recital of her misdeeds and her sentence occupied the hours from 6 A. M. to 4 P. M. During this time she was mounted on a scaffold with a gag in her mouth, a halter around her neck, and a lighted taper in her hand. She was merely condemned to perpetual reclusion in a convent of her Order, without the right to vote or to be voted for; she was to be the last in choir, refectory and chapter; for a year she was daily in the refectory to perform an act of penitence, and for three years she was not, except in case of mortal sickness, to receive the sacrament or to converse with any one except the nuns and her spiritual director. She was sent to the convent of Santa Clara at Andujar where she lived a most exemplary life, and at her death in 1560 it was piously hoped that all her sins had been expiated.[1]

[1] MSS. of the Bibliothèque Nationale of Paris, fonds Espagnol 354, fol. 248–69.—Llorente, II. 103–15.—Miscelanea de Zapata (Mem. Histórico Español. XI. 70).—Cipriano de Valera, Dos Tratados (Reformistas Antiguos Españoles, Madrid, 1851, p. 486).—Ribadeneira Vit. Ignat. Loyolæ Lib. v. c. 10.—Matute y Luquin, Coleccion de los Autos de Fé de Córdoba, Córdoba, 1839, p. 18.

In the Appendix to the *Mémoires de Francisco de Enzinas* (Bruxelles, 1863, T. II. pp. 462–506) M. Campan has printed a French translation of the sentence and confession made from a MS. in the British Museum. In some minor details it varies from the copy I have used from the Bibliothèque

As usual a legend formed itself around Magdalena, who became a witch working miracles with the aid of her demon incubus. While she was in dalliance with her lover an attendant imp would personate her in public, singing and praying and performing the customary devotional exercises. It was only when she grew tired of the connection that she repented and confessed.[1]

The outcome of this case seems to have repressed the industry of the *beatas revelanderas* and for a time we hear little of them. The next affair of the kind which I have found recorded is that of a male performer in Peru in 1566. The Spaniards carried their beliefs to the New World and as the Colonies became settled there was ample opportunity of speculating upon the credulity of the population, especially before the Inquisition came there to repress the industry. The impostor in question deserves credit for unrivalled boldness. He claimed that he was in perpetual intercourse with God—indeed, he had been offered and had refused hypostatic union with the Divine Essence; the Holy See was to be translated to America and he was to be the future pope; he would change the whole constitution of the Church and frame new and simple laws for its government. In the absence of the Inquisition argument had to take the place of force; the Jesuit, José da Costa, met him in public disputation and easily overcame him, after which, as we are told, he lost the reverence of the people.[2]

At home, mysticism continued to spread and flourish under such leaders as San Pedro de Alcántara and Santa Teresa. The example of the latter was especially stimulating, as we can see when the proceedings against her nuns at Seville in 1575 were accompanied by a letter from the Supreme Council of the Inquisition, October 25, to the subordinate tribunals asking suggestions as to the best method of suppressing the

Nationale, though both purport to be transcribed from a common source in the possession of the Licenciate Copones, Inquisitor of Seville.

[1] Amort, De Revelationibus, P. II. p. 26.

[2] Malvasiæ Cathalogus omnium Hæresum, p. 244.

abuses caused by the liberty of women wearing the religious habit and living at home without being subjected to any rule save obedience promised to the priests whom they selected as spiritual directors.[1] Evidently the multiplication of the beatas was becoming an evil of recognized magnitude with which it was difficult to deal. The next year, 1576, we find Padre Jerónimo Gracian consulting Teresa as to one of these beatas in Seville, and Teresa inclining to the belief that she is possessed with a demon. She prudently warns Gracian not to go to her house else the next thing may be a child fathered upon him.[2] As the century drew to a close and as the fame of Santa Teresa spread, everywhere there were women throwing themselves into trances and retailing their visions and revelations and prophecies. In 1588 all Spain was thrown into terror by a prediction that within the year the nation would be destroyed save a few elect who would be preserved, in the cave of San Gines at Toledo, to repopulate the land.[3] Every town, almost every hamlet had its local saint who was regarded with intense veneration and was assured of an abundant livelihood.[4] The stigmata, which had so long been reserved as a distinguishing grace bestowed upon St. Francis, became a matter of everyday occurrence. A Jesuit, writing in 1634, casually alludes to two new cases which had just been brought to notice—a nun of la Concepcion in Salamanca and another at Búrgos—and he adds that they had become so common that no woman esteems herself a servant of God unless she can exhibit them. In fact, there was a prophecy, currently attributed to St. Francis, that about this time Christ would reward many pious souls in this manner.[5]

After the exposure of Magdalena de la Cruz no very prominent case came before the Inquisition until that of María de

[1] Llorente, III. 54.

[2] S. Teresa, Carta CXXVIII. (Escritos, II. 116).

[3] Godoy Alcántara, Hist. de los falsos Cronicones, pp. 3–4.

[4] Godoy Alcántara, p. 2. Cf. V. de la Fuente, Hist. Ecles. de España III. 255.

[5] Cartas de Jesuitas (Mem. Histor. Español, XIII. 49, 51).

la Visitacion in 1588. Thus far the Dominicans had not been much given to mystic extravagance, but in her they had a saint whom they exploited to the utmost, and the disgrace in which her career ended served them as a salutary lesson to preserve them in the future from similar erratic zeal. María was born about 1556; at the age of eleven she entered the convent of la Anunziata in Lisbon; at sixteen she made profession, when Christ appeared to her and took her as his spouse. From this time forth he constantly favored her with visions, conversing familiarly with her and showering graces upon her as God did upon Moses. Besides this, the saints of the Order, such as Dominic, Catherine of Siena and Thomas Aquinas, frequently appeared to her. In 1583, at the age of twenty-seven, she was made prioress of the convent and her fame spread not only through the Peninsula but throughout Europe and to the furthest confines of the Indies.

In 1580 Portugal had passed under the domination of Philip II., whose viceroy and inquisitor general was Albert, Archduke of Austria and Cardinal of Santo Croce in Gerusalemme. In 1584 Cardinal Albert sent a detailed statement of María's miraculous life to Gregory XIII., who replied expressing his gratification and praying the Divine Goodness to render her daily more worthy of his grace and to enrich her with celestial gifts to the glory of his name and the comfort of the faithful. About the same time the Portuguese Provincial, Fray Antonio de la Cerda, wrote two letters of the same kind to his agent in Rome, Fray Hernando de Castro, to be shown to the pope. The Venerable Fray Luis de Granada also wrote an account to the Patriarch of Valencia. These letters were printed in Italy and then translated into French and embodied in a work by the Dominican Étienne de Lusignan, published in Paris in 1586 and dedicated to the queen, Louise de Lorraine. Thus we have contemporary accounts of her while at the height of her reputation.[1]

[1] Les grands Miracles et les Tressainctes Playes advenuz à la R. Mere Prieure auiourd'huy 1586 du Monasteire de l' Anonciade en la ville de

Her miraculous manifestations were substantially the same as those which we have seen in the case of Magdalena de la Cruz. When praying in her cell her sister nuns would see her lifted from the floor, surrounded with splendor, and with light beaming from her face and breast. It twice happened that when the sisterhood were receiving the sacrament through the grille the supply was exhausted and no wafer was left for her, but she prayed with tears to Christ, the pyx spontaneously opened, a consecrated host lifted itself out and flew to her mouth. On another occasion when she felt an intense desire for the sacrament she fell into an ecstasy in which she saw St. John the Evangelist and on waking she found a wafer in her mouth. About 1580 Christ crucified appeared to her in splendor, when a ray of fire darted from his side to hers, producing a red mark like a lance-thrust, from which, on Fridays, drops of blood distilled with much pain. The stigmata were completed in 1584, in a similar vision on the feast of St. Thomas Aquinas, March 7. These were round, like nail-holes, red and causing her much suffering. They were examined and vouched for by Fray Luis de Granada, who also reported that on every Thursday, at the hour of Ave María, she felt in her head a pain like the crown of thorns, when thirty-two punctures appeared with drops of blood, and this lasted till Friday at the same hour.

Miracles, duly attested by notarial acts, were of course not lacking to prove her sanctity. A woman given over by the physicians was suddenly cured by a drink of water in which had been placed a piece of a cross presented by María to a lady. She was accustomed to press fragments of cloth to the wound in her side, when they would come away with five

Lisbonne, au Royaume de Portugal, approuvez par R. Pere Frere Loys de Granade et autres personnes dignes de foy, côme se verra à la fin du discours. À Paris, par Jean Bressant, 1586 (Cipriano de Valera, Enjambre de Falsos Milagros, and the notes of Usóz y Rio, Madrid, 1851).

Valera also gives an account of the exposure, drawn from the "Relazion de la santidad y llagas de la Madre María de la Visitacion," Seville, 1589.

blood-spots arranged in the form of a cross. These were much prized for their supernatural powers. She gave one to a certain Doña Vincenzia, who handed it to a lady of rank afflicted with a cancer of the lip which was to be cut out the next day; the sufferer placed it on her mouth over night and in the morning the cancer had disappeared. Paramo tells us that these cloths were sent with incredible devotion to the pope and throughout Christendom and that they were much prized as relics. While he was inquisitor in Sicily he saw several of them, one of which was greatly valued by the Countess of Urrea, wife of the viceroy, the Count of Alva. It is said that the royal standard of the Invincible Armada, then fitting out for sea in Lisbon, was blessed by her with great solemnity in April, 1588, a few months before her downfall.

Had María been prudent she possibly might have enjoyed a career as long as that of Magdalena de la Cruz, but she incautiously allowed herself to be drawn into politics. Portugal was dissatisfied with Spanish rule and was restlessly longing for a restoration of independence. It shows what was the condition of popular intelligence when a nun like Madre María could be a factor of political importance, but so it was, and she was detected in nursing plans for an uprising. Her exposure became a necessity and it was not difficult to obtain from the nuns of the Annunciacion sufficient evidence to justify an investigation. A commission for the purpose was formed, consisting of the Archbishops of Lisbon and Braga, the Bishop of La Guardia, the Inquisitors of Lisbon and Doctor Pablo Alfonso of the Royal Council—an assemblage of dignitaries which shows the importance attached to the case. The commission visited the convent and took the testimony of the nuns, who declared unanimously that María's sanctity was feigned and her stigmata fictitious. Then she was brought before them and sworn to tell the truth, with the warning that if she did so God would help her, if not, the devil would carry her off. This did not frighten her; she

asserted her truthfulness and the reality of her stigmata, and in this she persisted although told that there was ample evidence against her and that she should have mercy if she would ask for it. The commission postponed further proceedings until another day, when they solved the question with a vigorous application of soap and water. At first she pretended great agony, but as the paint disappeared she broke down and cast herself at the feet of her judges shrieking for mercy. Her examination was humanely postponed until the next day when she made a full confession. The marks on her hands and feet were painted; those on her side and head she made with a knife when necessary; the blood-stained rags were prepared in advance and dexterously drawn out; the glory which illuminated her face was arranged by darkening her cell and using a brazier and mirror; her elevation from the floor by a clever adaptation of sticks.

Her sentence was read to her, December 6, 1588, in the Franciscan convent of Madre de Dios, and was published on the 8th from the pulpit of the cathedral at high mass. It was vastly more severe than that of Magdalena de la Cruz, doubtless in consequence of her political offence. She was but thirty-two years old and the condemnation to perpetual seclusion in a convent meant a prolonged imprisonment. Besides this, the convent was not to be of her own Order, the Dominican; for a year she was to be scourged every Wednesday and Friday in the chapter-house during the chanting of a *Miserere;* she was to observe perpetually an ecclesiastical fast and on Wednesdays and Fridays to have only bread and water; whenever she entered the refectory she was to recite her crime to the nuns in an audible voice, she was to eat on the floor and what she left was to be cast out as contaminated, when the meal was over she was to prostrate herself in the door-way to be trampled on by the outgoing nuns, and she was never to converse with any one, inside or outside the house, save by special permission of the superior. Death would seem to be merciful in comparison with an existence

thus steeped in suffering and humiliation, but it is reported of her that she performed her cruel penance with such patience and humility that she became saintly in reality and ended her life in happiness.[1]

This affair seems to have aroused the Inquisition to a sense of the necessity of more active work in suppressing the prevailing tendency, for we hear of several other cases which speedily followed. Towards the close of 1588 a Padre Leon of Seville, who passed for a man of the loftiest religious zeal, was accused by the brethren of his Order and was found to be a hypocrite, abandoned to sensual indulgences.[2] At Jaen, the bishop, Francisco Sarmiento, employed Padre Jerónimo Gracian to investigate certain "illusions and abominations," which were duly punished by the Inquisition, and the Archbishop of Évora called him in to dissipate other illusions and revelations which promised the return of Don Sebastian.[3] Possibly among these culprits may have been a *beata* of Jaen, named Mari-Romera, who about this time figured in an *auto* at Córdova. She had ecstasies lasting four or five days in which she neither ate nor drank, and when the bishop and inquisitor tested her by thrusting pins into her flesh and blowing smoke up her nostrils she bore the torment without wincing. Her spiritual director was Gaspar Lucas, prior of the convent of San Bartolomé. There were many other *beatas* in Jaen who became jealous of the preference shown for her by Gaspar; they kept watch upon the pair and

[1] Cipriano de Valera, Enjambre de Falsos Milagros, with the notes of Usóz y Rio (Reformistas Antiguos Españoles, Madrid, 1851).—Paramo de Orig. Offic. S. Inquis. pp. 233–4, 302–4.

Mármol attributes to Jerónimo Gracian the credit of discovering the frauds of Madre María and assumes that it exposed him to no little trouble.—Vida del P. Jerónimo Gracian (Escritos de S. Teresa, II. 474).

The death of Luis de Granada, which was almost simultaneous with the sentence, was naturally attributed to mortification at having assisted to give currency to the fraud.

[2] Usóz y Rio, *loc. cit.*

[3] Mármol, Vida del P. Jerónimo Gracian (*ubi sup.* II. 480).

obtained proof of their improper relations. The Inquisition easily found means to extort confession from both, and after exhibiting them as alumbrados condemned him to seclusion in a convent of the Order of la Merced, while she was sentenced to serve for life in the hospital of San Juan de Dios in Granada.[1] Then there was a Miguel Piedrola of Marañon, who had visions and revelations, indulged in prophecies and was reverenced as a saint, until the Inquisition detected his impostures and condemned him to perpetual imprisonment, forbidding him to dispute about Scripture or to use pen and ink and the Bible or other sacred books, or to send and receive letters except on family business.[2] At the *auto de fé* in Toledo, June 9, 1591, which was honored by the presence of Philip II. and his children, a young lady of Alcazar named María de Morales, was sentenced to a hundred lashes and a year's banishment for obtaining a false reputation for holiness by pretended trances and revelations and prophecies.[3]

It is not probable that the Inquisition relaxed its vigilance or that the mystics, true and false, diminished in numbers and audacity, but the fragmentary records remaining accessible leave a considerable interval at this period. In 1616 we hear of Juana de Estrada prosecuted in Mexico for claiming that she enjoyed special graces from God.[4] When the rejoicings at the accession of Philip IV., in 1621, were completed with an *auto de fé*, celebrated on June 21, one of the culprits was María de la Concepcion, described as an alumbrada who had long enjoyed great reputation through her ectasies and revelations, but who had shamefully abandoned herself to her spiritual director and other priests. She was accused of having made a pact with Satan, and of numberless heresies, including Lutheranism and Calvinism,

[1] Matute y Luquin, Coleccion de los Autos de Fé de Córdoba, Córdoba, 1839, p. 18.

[2] Paramo, p. 304.

[3] MSS. of the Biblioteca Nacional of Madrid, D. 111, fol. 127.

[4] MSS. of David Fergusson, Esq.

and could esteem herself fortunate in escaping with two hundred lashes and imprisonment for life.[1]

The next record we have is of the prosecutions at Seville in 1623. In that hotbed of mysticism there was ample field for religious impostors who drove a thriving trade on the credulity of the devout, and in the *auto de fé* of 1624 no less than eight were punished, as follows:—

Beatriz de Robles, a Morisca, aged 48. She had the customary trances and ecstasies; after receiving communion she would sometimes faint, or would lean against the wall, sighing and trembling with excess of divine love, or absorbed as if insensible. She had seen Christ and had asked "How much do you love me?" when he had replied "I love you much and have descended on earth for you." All this and much else she confessed was fraudulent, invented for the purpose of acquiring the reputation of a saint. She was condemned to abjure *de levi*, and to be confined in a woman's hospital for two years, where she was to work for her support.

Antonia de San Francisco, a Franciscan, aged 30. While yet a girl she had had a trance of twenty-four hours' duration in which she saw purgatory. Her specialty was ecstacies in which she saw the souls in purgatory, and informed their friends how many prayers and masses were requisite for their release. She confessed that this was all deceit to gain reputation as a saint and to extort money. Her sentence was abjuration *de levi*, confinement with labor for six months in a woman's hospital, banishment for two years from her birthplace, Xeres, and such other penance as the discretion of the inquisitors might impose.

Barbara de Jesus, a Carmelite, aged 30. She was convicted of uttering many propositions of the alumbrados—that she had attained a high grade of contemplation and was in the Holy Trinity, that she was impeccable and that the devil could not tempt her; that this high grade of contemplation

[1] Llorente, III. 463.

was exhausting and necessitated a generous diet, that communion with numerous wafers was especially efficacious. She once saw the host turn black in the hands of the officiating priest, showing that he was not in a state of grace, when she called to him, reproving him and telling him to mend his ways. Once when praying a white dove had settled on her head, which was a sign that she could not sin. She had the customary trances and visions of God and the Virgin and Satan, and had been embraced by Christ, all of which she confessed were inventions. She was sentenced to abjure *de levi*, to be confined in a woman's hospital for two years, with labor, and never to talk about visions and revelations.

Ana de los Santos, a girl of 12. She could read the thoughts of others, even when not present; she had visions of heaven, hell, and purgatory; she described the punishment in the latter of persons whom she had known, and her prayers and intercessions were efficacious for their release. All these she confessed were fabrications by a relative and an intimate friend, a priest, who used to send her to convents with these stories to gain money for them. She was ordered to be confined in a convent for two years, working for her board, and never to talk about revelations and ecstasies.

Caterina de Jesus, a Basilian, aged 30. She had the spirit of prophecy and was an alumbrada of the first rank, having reached a state of perfection in which she could not sin, or even say an Ave Maria or a Paternoster, and needed no penitence. She enjoyed the customary trances and visions and had a confederate, a priest, who likewise pretended to peculiar sanctity. On one occasion a person suddenly entering her room found them in bed together; he made grimaces, rolled his eyes and lolled out his tongue, and she declared that it was a demon who had assumed his likeness. She confessed her amour with the priest and her deceits, which she said were for the purpose of gaining a good livelihood. Her sentence was abjuration *de levi*, confinement with labor for

two years in a convent or woman's hospital, and prohibition to talk about her visions.

Juan de Jesus, known as *el Hermito,* aged 58. He is described as simple in the ways of the world but remarkably learned and persuasive in spiritual matters. He was convicted of all the alumbrado errors. He professed to be insensible to the temptations of the flesh; God had deprived him of all free-will and he was governed solely by the spirit. Religious observances were superfluous to him, for he was always in the presence of God. The fervor of his love for God was so ardent that when he drank water it hissed. He had asked of God the purity of the angels, when God replied "Not that, but mine own will I give thee!" whereupon he had been carried to heaven and baptized, the Virgin acting as godmother, St. John as godfather, Christ as priest and St. Joseph as sacristan. His power extended over both worlds, for not only could he heal the sick but at one time he had prayed 8000 souls out of purgatory, at another 30,000, at another 22,000, at another 80,000, and then all that were left, leaving it vacant. He had the spirit of prophecy and was shrewd enough to have had a revelation from God that all who gave him alms would be saved. He had kept a woman deceived for years with the belief that she was pregnant and would give birth to the reformer of the Church and redeemer of the world, of whom he was the forerunner. In general his relations with women are unfit for transcription. He confessed that his claims of sanctity were an imposture to gain a good living. He was evidently regarded as more dangerous than the women, for he was sentenced to receive a hundred lashes in the streets of Seville, to be shut up for life in a hospital or convent, working for his board, and to pray one-third of the rosary daily.

Mariana de Jesus, a Barefooted Carmelite, aged 30. She was a *Maestra de Espiritu* who taught the alumbrado errors and furnished an endless recital of visions, conflicts with the devil, evidences of prophetic power, etc. She had repre-

sented that she neither ate nor drank, but subsisted wholly on the Eucharist, while in reality she had been feasting on capons, hares, and other delicacies. She seems to have traded more openly than usual on her spiritual gifts, and poor people had pledged their household gear to purchase her intercession for the souls of their kindred. It was probably this which caused her to be rather more sharply dealt with than her female fellow convicts. She was not only to appear in the *auto de fé* but to be, the next day, exhibited *á la verguenza* through the streets of Seville, to abjure *de levi*, to be shut up for four years in a convent or hospital where she was daily to pray three-quarters of the rosary, to receive the sacrament but thrice a year and to fast for life on Mondays, Wednesdays and Fridays. Moreover, she was banished for life from the Archbishopric of Seville.

Bárbara María del Espíritu, a professed nun. For many years she had been a *Maestra de Espíritu*, professing alumbrado errors and having trances, visions, and prophetic insight. She and the priest her confessor often had trances together in which many *cosas malhonestas* occurred. On one occasion in a convent she assembled all the nuns, made them confess to her and assigned them penance. She admitted that it was all an imposture for the sake of obtaining a comfortable livelihood. She must have enjoyed an extensive reputation, for a clause of her sentence orders all the writings on her life and revelations to be surrendered and suppressed. For the rest, she was confined for four years to her convent cell, never leaving it except for the choir and refectory, in which she was to occupy the last place. She was to recite daily a third of the rosary, to receive the sacrament but thrice a year, and to fast on Mondays, Wednesdays and Fridays.[1]

[1] Relacion de las Personas que salieron al auto publico de la fee . . . . deste año de 1624 (MSS. of Bodleian Library, Arch S. 130).

There is interest in observing how these superstitions are handed down from one age to another. Gerson reports a case occurring in 1424 at Bourg en Bresse in Savoy, where a woman gained her livelihood by having ecstasies

The following year in an *auto de fé* held at Córdoba, December 2, 1625, a hermit named Miguel Tello was condemned as an alumbrado and impostor. He had the customary revelations and celestial visions and could see in a glowing coal the diadem of the three powers which is placed on the head of Christ. His wandering brain indulged in more dangerous and heretical speculations, for he asserted that Christ had no soul and that the Godhead served him as a soul; also that councils were so fully under the influence of the Holy Ghost that if the Moors held a council it would guide them. He was only sentenced never to wear the habit of a hermit, and to remain for two years in a designated convent performing labor and receiving instruction in the faith.[1]

Perhaps the most noteworthy fact in these cases is the extreme moderation of the penalties imposed. Of this the probable explanation is that the supernatural gifts thus claimed and exploited, which seem to us so impudently extravagant, were almost commonplace occurrences to the Spaniards of that day, and might be rather regarded as matters of edification when they were not accompanied with alumbrado errors or gross immorality. I have before me a *calificacion* or censure of the writings of Mariana de Jesus, dated November

and revelations. She was one of five sent by God in mercy to release souls from hell (not purgatory), and every day she had the privilege of liberating three. She was finally arrested and under torture confessed the imposture and that she was an epileptic. It was debated whether she should be burnt, but she was finally admitted to penance.—Gersoni de Exam. Doctrinarum Consid. vi.

[1] Relacion del Auto General de la Fé . . . . deste año de 1625 (Bodleian Library, Arch S. 130).—Matute y Luquin, Coleccion de los Autos de Fé de Córdoba, Cordoba, 1839, p. 40.

In this same year, 1625, the Inquisition of Mexico had three similar cases pending before it—of Ana de San Ambrosio, nun of the convent of Jesus María, Ana de San Francisco, nun of the convent of La Concepcion, and Diego Felipe, a hermit (MSS. of David Fergusson, Esq.).

In an *auto* held in Madrid in 1632 a number of similar offenders were punished, but we have no details of their cases.—Coleccion de Documentos inéditos, Tom. LXIX. p. 182.

30, 1630, a book in two volumes apparently printed not long before. The writer speaks with the utmost respect of Mariana as a most holy woman whose claims for canonization were then under consideration by the Holy See, but he thinks it time that some check should be put on the ardors of these visionary souls whose ecstasies offer to the enemies of Spain occasion to stigmatize the nation as one whose women are given to ecstasies, apocalypses and raptures. He quietly but shrewdly points out that the penitences and miracles ascribed to Mariana are greater than those which are authenticated of any three prominent saints of antiquity. As for her revelations, he argues that they could not be of God: Firstly, because they are not in accordance with Scripture, for the holy men of old were seized with fear and trembling when they had visions of the Lord, while Mariana relates how she embraced Christ and kissed him on many occasions: Secondly, on account of their undignified character, of which he gives many examples, such as Christ in a wet robe, dropping hands and feet from his head like drops of water—a gambler in purgatory dealing out live coals like cards—one of the actors in the Passion setting his teeth through the fleshy part of her arm and tearing off a portion of her ear—Christ saying to his executioners "I could knock down three men like you with a single blow of my fist," etc.: Thirdly, that sometimes these revelations are incompatible with truth, in proof of which various inaccuracies are pointed out: Fourthly, that God in his revelations always observes nature and proportion, and all the prophets speak after their kind, while the Blessed Mariana, who was a laboring woman, cites passages of Scripture on every occasion, quotes St. Bernard and St. Augustine, and uses the terms of scholastic theology in discussing the Passion and salvation, which at least arouses suspicion of the good faith of the historiographer: Fifthly, that the spirit of God is humble, while she magnifies herself, and she attributes to the angels things unworthy of them, as some *coplas* sung by them of such wretched verse that they would disgrace the

blind: Sixthly, that the spirit of God is sparing of words, while these revelations are excessively diffuse and spun out with unnecessary verbiage. It is true, he adds, that much of the same sort is to be found in the revelations of St. Hildegarda, St. Birgitta, St. Matilda, Angela de Foligno, St. Gertrude and St. Teresa, but these at least are dignified, they have been scrutinized and published by authority, and are written in Latin, while there is much to object to in printing such things in the vulgar tongue at a time when so many women are fancying themselves possessed by the spirit of God and are earning their living by having visions and revelations.[1] No one who is familiar with the multitude of works

[1] Sobre Revelaciones de Mugeres, ya por ocasion de los Libros de Mariana de Jesus (MSS. of Bodleian Library, Arch S. 130).

The subject of this *calificacion* was doubtless the Blessed María Ana de Jesus, a *Madrileña*, born in 1565 and died in 1624. She was a member of the Order of Merced. I have not met with the book of her revelations, but her biography was written in 1673 by Fray Juan de la Presentacion, a member of the same Order and official historiographer of Philip IV. He called it *La Corona de Madrid*, and subsequently abridged it under the title of *La Guirnalda Sacra*, reprinted in Madrid, 1784. The effort to canonize her began soon after her death and was repeated at intervals until she was beatified in 1783, the principal evidence, as stated in the decree of the Congregation of Rites, August 31, 1782, being that when her tomb was opened in 1731 the body, although not embalmed, was found uncorrupted, with the flesh soft and elastic as in life. Her biographer assures us that when an infant at the breast she gave evidences of her future sanctity; when but four years old she was constantly in prayer, and at six she had ecstasies, visions and revelations. She says herself that her soul was ordinarily illuminated by God, who manifested his will to her unmistakably (Vida, Ed. 1784, pp. 6, 10, 275).

She was by no means the only contemporary Mariana de Jesus. We have just seen one of the same name penanced in the Seville *auto* of 1624. There was also another Venerable Mariana de Jesus, a Barefooted Clare of the convent of San Antonio in Trujillo, who was of German birth and had accompanied Ann of Austria when she married Philip II. Through the grace of God she understood Latin without studying it, and Philip III. paid her a visit when on his way to Portugal in 1619 for his son to receive the oath of allegiance (Barrantes, Aparato, III. 88–90).

Peru at the same time had another saintly Mariana de Jesus, known as *la azucena de Quito*, born in 1618 and died in 1645, whose miracles com-

of the kind which poured from the Spanish presses will question the validity of the criticism of the good *calificador*, but it was useless, for the book was not placed on the Index.

Tolerant as the Inquisition thus sometimes showed itself as to these eccentricities of illumination it persisted in its efforts to abate the nuisance of the *beatas revelanderas*, the women who were multiplying everywhere with their ecstasies and visions and prophecies, and who commanded the implicit veneration of the people. In accomplishing this the first endeavor usually was to convict them of some heresy, alumbrado or other, and failing this to force them to confess immorality or imposture. The process is well illustrated in the case of Sister Lorenza de Simancas, a Franciscan tertiary, who for sixteen years enjoyed great reputation at Valladolid. She had ecstasies and revelations on every occasion, at church and elsewhere, and her little house was an object of pilgrimage to all the inhabitants of the city and its vicinity, when she would throw herself into a trance at the request of any one. It was a profitable profession, for she started in miserable poverty and was soon able to live in affluence. Her arrest, April 29, 1634, caused general excitement, and it was whispered that she had been detected in keeping two lovers, besides which her Franciscan confessor was also suspected. In three examinations before the tribunal she persistently maintained the reality of her visions, adding marvel to marvel, till the inquisitors grew impatient and tortured her smartly, when she confessed that it was all an imposture. She was sentenced to two hundred lashes and

menced before her birth, and who began mortifying the flesh by persistently refusing to suckle before mid-day. It was in vain that in her humility she prayed to be denied the favor of visions and miracles. The effort to canonize her was commenced in 1670, but it was not till 1850 that she was beatified by Pius IX. Not long after her death her biography was written by the Jesuit Jacinto Morán de Butron, which has been modernized by another Jesuit and reprinted in Madrid in 1854. Another life, by P. Gijon y Leon appeared in Madrid in 1754, and there have been three editions of an Italian biography by the Canon Juan del Castillo of Chile.

banishment for six years from Simancas and all other towns where she had lived.[1]

Simultaneous with this was a case which attracted the attention of all Spain and exhibits the success of the Inquisition in detecting heresy where there was no conscious fraud and only an exaggeration of the prevailing superstition. Doña Luisa de Colmenares, who took the name of Luisa de la Ascencion, was a Franciscan nun of the convent of Santa Clara at Carrion de los Condes. She was seventy years of age, of which fifty-three had been passed in convents. She had the usual facility of ecstasies, and in her palms there was a reticulation of veins which could readily be regarded as stigmata. Consequently she had long enjoyed an extraordinary reputation for sanctity—indeed, she was reverenced as though already canonized during life. It was claimed for her that she had been sanctified in her mother's womb and had been privileged to see the Divine Essence. When Charles I. of England came to Spain in 1623, as Prince of Wales, to seek a bride, he paid Madre Luisa a visit and was much impressed by her holiness and her familiarity with celestial mysteries. Philip IV. venerated her and popes were her correspondents. There was an immense demand for objects sanctified by her —crosses, beads, images of the Christ-child and other similar things—the sale of which was very profitable, and it was reckoned that between this and the offerings of pilgrims who sought her retreat, the Franciscans had cleared some two hundred thousand ducats by her, to say nothing of the prospective glory and profit to accrue to the Order if they could secure her canonization after death.

It is not clear what induced the Inquisition to lay hands on her in 1635 after she had so long been allowed to enjoy her reputation for sanctity in peace. In the superstition of the time the temptation was strong to employ for political ends the veneration felt for these mouthpieces of God, and

[1] Cartas de Jesuitas (Mem. Histórico Español, XIII. 42, 51, 457).

there may be truth in the rumor that Madre Luisa had been induced to write to Philip IV. against the Count-Duke Olivares, and that he thereupon made use of the Inquisition to disarm so formidable an antagonist. Be this as it may, in January, 1635, the Supreme Council of the Inquisition sent orders to Juan Santos, the senior inquisitor of Valladolid, to examine her. The methods adopted show that even the Holy Office, which had no hesitation in striking at the greatest nobles and prelates, felt the need of circumspection in dealing with a feeble old woman, protected by the universal and unbounded veneration of the people. Juan Santos made pretence of a visit to the Bishop of Palencia and on his way stopped at Carrion for a fortnight interrogating Luisa. His practised skill had doubtless an easy task in entangling an ignorant nun in theological aberrations, and his success was seen when his report was followed by an order for her arrest. Still the utmost caution was observed. On March 26 a carriage was sent to Carrion, with a female relative of one of the inquisitors, Madre Luisa was put in it and conveyed to Valladolid. Miracles accompanied her departure. A pillar of light, which changed into a cross, appeared in heaven, and was seen in Plasencia, Valladolid and even as far as Búrgos. The whole population of Carrion turned out, and the journey was a triumphal procession, the people flocking from far and near to catch a glimpse of her. Men threw themselves under the carriage and its wheels passed over their heads and necks without inflicting injury. As it neared Valladolid the city emptied itself to meet her, though the hour of arrival was ten o'clock at night, and a roundabout way had to be taken to get into the town. The corregidor reported that the people rose in arms to rescue her and that he had infinite pains to soothe them and keep the peace. She was not immured in the inquisitorial prison but was taken to the convent de la Encarnacion of the Augustinian Recollects, and formally delivered to the Bishop of Valladolid to be confined there, with orders that no one was to be allowed to

speak with her. The press was tremendous and though many persons were thrown down and trampled upon, nobody was injured. The Count of Benavente, the greatest noble of the land, was there, and with scissors he cut off part of her veil to keep as a relic. In an instant the remainder was torn off of her head and rent into fragments. Everyone strove to touch her hand or the cross on her rosary, or even her garments, and not the least miracle of the journey was that she was at last conveyed into the convent unharmed by her ungovernable worshippers.

Letters from the prioress and others of the convent are full of wonder at her saintliness and of gratitude that their house was selected to be blessed with the presence of this most holy creature. No words could be found adequate to express her virtues. They describe her as very small and high shouldered; her teeth had been knocked out by the devil with sharp blows and her eyesight had been destroyed in the same way; she ate nothing and scarcely slept. She is an angel on earth; the fiercest persecution of the Inquisition is not to be dreaded, for God will protect the soul which he has allowed to be exposed to a blow so terrible; she is a prodigy of grace, the honor of her age and the wonder of sanctity in those which are to come, for she is destined to be the most powerful saint in the annals of the Church. Yet one thing was observable: in Carrion she had had ecstasies every day; they were celebrated by sounding the organ during their continuance and everybody rushed to see them, but in the retirement of the Valladolid convent they ceased. One noteworthy incident of her confinement was that the English ambassador with his son came to Valladolid, November 15, and reported that Charles I. had ordered him to deliver a message to Madre Luisa. The instructions of the Supreme Council were imperative that no one should see her and the inquisitors dared not disobey, but it was finally arranged that they should know nothing about it, while the bishop carried the ambassador and his son to the convent. He had a private conference with her

through the grille, which lasted some time, and at its conclusion she fell into a trance, when the prioress uncovered her face and the two Englishmen knelt before her in great devotion. The younger one begged for a cross from her and the bishop gave him one which he received with profound veneration. Their bearing was such as to convince all present that they were Catholics at heart though obliged to feign Protestantism.

Meanwhile Madre Luisa's case was slowly proceding amid a chaos of conflicting interests. The Franciscans officially undertook her defence. The population of Valladolid, with the bishop at their head, were unanimous in her favor and the local inquisitors weakened. The Supreme Council was obliged to rebuke them and to send a special commissioner to expedite and supervise the trial. The Jesuits were secretly delighted at the blow which was about to fall upon a rival Order, but while at work below the surface were especially careful to avoid popular hostility by openly taking part against her. It was not difficult to make her convict herself of heresy, for she was foolish and ignorant, full of vainglory and merely a tool in the hands of the rapacious friars who had been exploiting her reputation for sanctity. A paper was produced with her signature in which she asserted that she had seen the Divine Essence, that she was confirmed in grace, that when six years old Christ had removed her heart of flesh and had substituted his own, that he had given her an apple of paradise through which she would remain immortal until the day of judgment, when she would accompany Enoch and Elias in the war with Antichrist, that God sustained her without food, and much more of the same kind. It was charitably averred that the papers of this description which were in circulation were written by her confessors and signed by her without reading, but when she was examined by the inquisitors she declared that she had seen the Divine Essence, though when questioned it was found that she knew nothing of the orthodox doctrine of the Trinity and she

replied with a thousand follies. She stuck to the assertion that God had revealed to her that all who possessed her crosses, beads, rosaries, and other objects of devotion would be saved unconditionally and could rest secure of their predestination. In her efforts to defend her position we can readily believe the assertion that the trained intellects of her judges forced her to tell many lies.

In such a case the outcome was inevitable. As a preliminary to conviction the Inquisition issued an edict, October 23, 1636, requiring the surrender, under pain of excommunication, of all images, portraits, crosses, beads, letters and histories relating to her. These were extraordinarily numerous. The Bishop of Guadix, Dionisio Portocarrero, who was commissioner for the trial, sent in thousands of her letters, in nearly all of which there was some allusion to money. The Duke of Aerschot had two thousand of her crosses which he had had prepared. In a few days the cura of the parish of San Miguel collected a room full of crosses, beads, medals, images and old rags from her devotees. The Jesuits, who knew what was coming, had some time before held a consultation in which it was determined to surrender all such objects, but that, before the appearance of the edict, it would be lawful to melt down all that were of gold and silver and thus save the precious metals.

This edict was speedily followed by the death of Madre Luisa, which occurred in November, 1636, and which possibly was hastened by it. A dead heretic was as much the subject of inquisitorial prosecution as a living one, and the inquisitors of Valladolid were justly incensed when they learned that the bishop had buried her without their permission, for she was their prisoner although permitted to reside in the Augustinian convent. Then followed an edifying squabble over her decaying remains. The inquisitors summoned the bishop to state what he had done and under what authority he had acted, and they prohibited his further interference in the matter. Feeling that he had overwhelming

popular sentiment at his back he boldly retorted that he had done what he had a right to do and notified them to drop the matter for with her death their authority to enter the convent had ceased; he added a significant warning not to give cause for a popular uprising, and that if such occurred he would hold them responsible. Undeterred by this threat they went to the convent with their secretary, exhumed the body and executed a formal notarial act that they had verified it to be that of Madre Luisa. Ten days later the Supreme Council vindicated its jurisdiction by ordering it to be again disinterred and to be formally buried by authority of the Inquisition.

Although the edict of October 23 had virtually decided the matter it did not end the case. No formal sentence had been uttered and the Franciscans talked of appealing to the pope, but were laughed at for their pains. The affair however had lost all practical importance; Madre Luisa was dead, there was no danger of her canonization, and she was speedily becoming forgotten, so further references to her case become scanty. In October, 1538, it was still of sufficient moment for the Inquisition to forbid its being talked about. In 1643 it was referred to Arce y Reynoso together with that of San Plácido; in April, 1644, after he had become inquisitor general, we are told that he was pushing it with much energy. Whether it ever reached a formal conclusion does not appear. Probably it was wisely allowed to be forgotten.[1]

During this period the number of miracle-working vision-

[1] Cartas de Jesuitas (Memorial Histórico Español, T. XIII. pp. 122, 150-62, 165, 173, 175, 177-80, 184, 205-7, 214, 222, 245, 267, 313, 324, 435, 528, 543, 547; T. XIV. pp. 12, 21, 47; T. XV. p. 80; T. XIX. p. 383).—Pellicer, Avisos históricos (Valladares, Semanario erúdito, T. XXXIII. pp. 99, 168).—The edict of the Inquisition is not in the Index of Sotomayor, 1640, but is in that of Vidal Marin, 1707, T. II. p. 19.

Madre Luisa had a friend who died in 1635, María de la Cruz, a Franciscan tertiary living in Olivenza, who also had great reputation as a beata of rare sanctity. She seems to have escaped the Inquisition.—Barrantes, Aparato para la Historia de Extremadura, III. 13.

aries seems rather to increase—possibly because the effort of the Inquisition to repress them brings to our knowledge the fact of their existence. Barrantes asserts that after the sixteenth century there was not an *auto de fé* in which there were not alumbrados punished,[1] and though the statement is exaggerated it has some foundation in fact. In the Madrid *auto* of 1632 Manuel Francisco de Silva was condemned as an impostor to a reprimand and eight years' banishment.[2] In 1634 Don Pedro de Arruego, lord of Lartosa, was prosecuted for superstition and pretended diabolical possession,[3] and the same year Juana la Embustera was punished at Madrid.[4] In 1635 at Córdoba a hermit named Juan de Jesus (evidently not the same as his homonym who appeared in the Seville *auto* of 1624) who enjoyed an immense reputation from Grenada to Madrid, was condemned as an alumbrado and impostor. Strong pressure from the court had been required to procure his conviction, though it was proved that his austerity, especially as regards chastity, was a figment. He was shut up for life in the convent del Jardín and ordered to fast as much as he could.[5] In 1637 there appeared in an *auto* at Toledo "el famoso Mateo Rodriguez," commonly known as the *Esterero santo*, or holy mat-maker, a native of Villafranca whose reputation extended from the highest classes to the lowest. He wore the habit of a Tertiary, and as he walked every one reverenced him and kissed his garments and invoked his intercession as a saint. He was wont to answer all with kindness; to those who needed help he promised to consult with God over their affairs, and to the sick that he would recommend them to the Lord. He had trances and prophesied and in his visions he was visited by the Divine Essence. All this brought him in many ducats,

[1] Barrantes, *op. cit.* II. 328.
[2] MSS. of Bodleian Library, Arch Seld. I. 1.
[3] Llorente, III. 497.
[4] V. de la Fuente, Hist. Eccles. de España, III. 257.
[5] Cartas de Jesuitas (Mem. Hist. Español, XIII. 162).

so that he abandoned his industry of mat-making and lived comfortably and was liberal in his charities. He even wrote an account of his life which we are told was as full of fables as the Korán. He was condemned to two hundred lashes of which half were administered in the streets of Toledo and half in those of Madrid.[1] In July, 1639, a Jesuit letter writer tells his correspondent that recently two *beatas revelanderas* had been sent by the Inquisition to the insane hospital of Toledo. This week another has been arrested of high repute for revelations. Such persons, he says, are suspected in these times and it is reported that others are to be seized, but "God has given us good luck in this that none of them are connected with the Society."[2]

The supply was as endless as the demand for practitioners of this kind, and the varieties were also endless. Lucrecia de Leon, who about this time was punished in an *auto de fé* at Toledo, had a vocation of a kind different from any of the above, and especially enticing because it required no exhausting austerities and trances. According to her own account she had commenced to dream at a very early age. Irresistible sleep would overcome her at any time or place, and when she awoke she could have no rest until she had made known her vision and its import. In this manner she had familiar acquaintance with the Trinity and its several persons, the Virgin, Moses, Elias, St. John the Baptist, St. Paul, St. Luke and other saints; she was transported to distant regions and the future was laid bare to her. In apocalyptic prophecies she foretold the destruction of kingdoms and their restoration, an approaching golden age in which the Holy Land and Turkey would be reconquered, and the seating of a Spaniard in the chair of St. Peter. It mattered little that the time appointed for some of these wonders passed by without their realization; the faith of her numerous disciples was not

[1] Cartas de Jesuitas (Ibid. XIV. 273).
[2] Cartas de Jesuitas (Ibid. XV. 295).

shaken and her prophecies were reduced to writing, commented upon, set forth pictorially and widely circulated. She also followed the somewhat more vulgar trade of a dream-expounder and taught the significance of all objects seen in dreams. It was impossible that an ignorant woman could meddle with subjects such as she habitually treated without losing herself in the mazes of the complicated scholastic theology into which she imprudently intruded, and the inquisitors had no trouble in convicting her of heretical notions on the subjects of penitence, the sacrifice of the mass, predestination, oral confession, the presence of God, the invocation of the Trinity, matrimony, the binding force of vows, and many others. She was shrewd enough to see that it was better to be penanced as an impostor than to be burnt as a heretic, so she freely admitted that all her dreams were a fraud, and she was sentenced to a hundred lashes, two years of reclusion, and perpetual banishment from Madrid and five leagues around it.[1]

Vainly might the Inquisition exert itself to suppress these superstitions so long as the beliefs of which they were but the eccentric manifestations were cherished by all classes and received the sanction of the highest powers in Church and State. In 1643, at Madrid, a boy four years of age obtained the reputation of being able to cure diseases with a touch. The shrewd and intelligent Jesuit who records it states that there can be no doubt of his possessing this grace, that invalids of all kinds crowded to his house, and that a few days before he had been brought to the royal palace to cure a priest eighty years old.[2] The craving for some mediator or intermediary between God and man, which lay at the root of the perennial confidence felt in an interminable succession of beatas, was manifested on a most imposing scale in this same year 1643. In the height of the calamities which threatened

[1] MSS. of the Biblioteca Nacional of Madrid, D. 111. fol. 135.

[2] Cartas de Jesuitas (Mem. Hist. Español, XVII. 284).

the very existence of the monarchy and drove Olivares from power, and in the midst of the confusion which followed the expulsion of the favorite, the queen received a letter without signature from an unknown *fraile*, stating that a servant of God, afflicted with the miseries of the land, had prayed earnestly for a remedy, and, after many days of penance and prayer, God had revealed to him that misfortunes would not cease till Spain should take St. Michael for its patron, that processions and fasts should be celebrated on the vespers of his apparition, May 8, and his feast be kept with all the solemnity customary for patron saints. Spain had long had Santiago as its patron and had recently added Santa Teresa, but the queen, instead of consigning the epistle to her waste-basket, handed it to the king, who submitted it to the royal council. Here the conclusion reached was that it might be of much service and could do no harm. Then the matter was laid before the Córtes, which voted that there should be a fast and procession on that day.[1] Eleven days later, on May 19, Condé answered to the solemnities on the field of Rocroy.

When such were the convictions which dominated all classes it is not to be wondered at that the veneration felt for the *beatas revelanderas* resisted the efforts of the Inquisition to repress it. About this time there occurred a typical case in Mexico which merits a somewhat detailed examination, as the documents which have been preserved enable us to follow not only the imposture itself but the methods of the Inquisition.[2]

[1] Cartas de Jesuitas (Ibid. XVII. 3).

Another illustration of the insatiable desire for objects of veneration was furnished in 1639 by Fray Luis Aparicio in a book calling attention to the neglect of the universal father Adam and arguing in favor of public cult to be rendered to him. The volume is entitled "Santidad y gloria sublime del universo padre de los hombres Adam. Ciencia de fé católica, veneracion y culto público que al Santísimo Padre puede consagrarse" and, as it does not appear in the Index, it seems to have been regarded as edifying.

[2] Three large volumes of the trials of Padre Joseph Bruñon de Vertiz and of Josepha de San Luis Beltran are in the collection of David Fergusson, Esq.

About the year 1645 there came to the city of Mexico from Tepetlastoc a man named Juan Romero Zapata with his family. Three of his daughters, Josepha de San Luis Beltran, Teresa de Jesus and Nicolasa de San Domingo were *mugeres del espíritu*, accustomed to trances and revelations. Of these Josepha was the most proficient. She had three kinds of trances—the *Rapto de Union*, lasting usually about fifteen minutes, in which she was silent but had visions, the *Rapto vocal*, in which she spoke by inspiration, and the *Rapto continuado* or *Estado de simpleza*, in which she spoke indistinctly, either detailing the visions of the *Rapto de Union*, or repeating what was communicated to her by her angel. In 1647 she lay in this state from Easter till Pentecost. At the termination of a *Rapto de Union* she would be lifted in the air and fall back upon the bed, and on one occasion she was elevated to the ceiling, shrieking to the bystanders to sprinkle her with holy water. These rare spiritual graces speedily attracted around the family a number of devotees, comprising laymen of consideration, monks and friars of all the Orders, secular priests, canons and other ecclesiastics. The attention of the Inquisition was called to these developments, and the Jesuit Padre Baltazar Lopez was deputed to investigate them; his report seems to have been favorable, and the family were allowed to gain their living in peace.

In 1647 there followed from Tepetlastoc to Mexico another sister, María de la Encarnacion, with her children and her husband Diego Pinto. They were miserably poor and kept a few cows for their living. Apparently stimulated by the success of Josepha, María soon adopted the same profession and set up a rival exhibition. Her manifestations were bolder, more imaginative and coarser than her sister's and drew off some of the latter's disciples. Josepha became

I understand that another volume of Bruñon's trial is in the possession of General Don Vicente Riva Palacio of Mexico. The papers of all the trials connected with the affair would doubtless form quite a small library.

jealous and insinuated that María's revelations were the work of the demon; María defended herself by asserting that as they rendered her humb'e and not proud they were evidently divine. The rivalry continued until, in June, 1649, Josepha sent her confessor, the Jesuit Bartolomé Castaria, to the archbishop. Castaria procured a commission to investigate María and her principal adherent, a priest named Joseph Bruñon de Vertiz. Bruñon quarrelled with him, and then, thoroughly frightened, applied first to the archbishop and then to the Inquisition to appoint a committee to examine the matter. In this he failed and after two or three months of anxious suspense the Inquisition intervened and on September 9, 1649, threw him and the sisters with their families into the *carceles secretas*.

Joseph Bruñon de Vertiz, the most interesting figure of the group, was a man of some culture. He had led an adventurous life in Spain, in the court, the camp, and the navy. In the Catalan wars he boasted that his feats of arms had won him the name of *El Caballero del Milagro*. In 1646 he came to Mexico, according to his own account, with the idea of entering the Church and proceeding as a missionary to China. Chance brought him into contact with Josepha. He had never, he said, seen such a case, and as the story of Madre Luisa de Carrion had excited his curiosity, he proceeded to study it. He seems to have been mystically inclined, for in preparing for ordination he read Thomas à Kempis and the Carthusian (Dionysius Rickel Carthusianus) and practised *recojimiento*. He was familiar with Scripture and with some of the Fathers and among his papers were found commentaries on the Pauline Epistles, some of them written in Latin. He was self-confident, vain of his acquirements, somewhat light-headed and in every way a fitting victim of the imposture. That he should fall completely into the toils was inevitable. He soon became engrossed with Josepha's revelations and proceeded to take them down in writing as she uttered them in her *raptos vocales*. The rough notes he would write out

and submit to her in her *raptos de simpleza*, when under the dictation of her angel she would correct them, striking out whole passages, substituting others, transposing and otherwise altering them. Of this he made a fair copy with which she was not yet satisfied and proposed to have it rewritten when their relations were broken off. The corrected copy has been preserved, forming a folio volume of nearly 600 closely written pages, containing forty-five *raptos* or *estaciones*, mostly conversations between Josepha and Christ, who address each other in the most endearing terms as loving spouses. They are thoroughly apocalyptic, in many parts enigmatical and metaphorical, showing her to be a woman of no little talent, well versed in the mystical conceptions of divine love. There is a curious allusion in the 21st *Estacion* to the *Peniculario*, which is explained as a place of temporary punishment, differing from purgatory in the severer character of its torment. The position which Josepha claimed in the divine economy is shown in a passage in the 35th *Estacion*, in which Christ asks her where she kept the key of purgatory and she answers by pointing to her belt. It would appear from the magnitude of the work accomplished and from the pains bestowed upon it that Josepha and Bruñon must have contemplated the issuing of a gospel of revealed mystic theology.

No imposture seems to have been too gross for the credulity of the disciples, although they consisted of educated men including licentiates and doctors of theology. Twice had Josepha been crowned with thorns, causing considerable effusion of blood, and the cloths bearing these precious stains were eagerly treasured as relics. Sometimes, on recovering from a trance, she would find in her mouth beads from the rosary of Santa Juana de la Cruz, brought to her by the Virgin, and there was great competition for their possession. On one occasion in a *rapto vocal* she said, as though the Spirit was speaking, "I will give thee a piece of the Sudarium from the body of the Lord," and presently a piece of linen

was seen floating in the air, which was eagerly divided up among those present. In another trance she wrote a paper at the dictation of Christ and sent it to Pedro Lopez de Covarruvias. A copy of this is among the documents of the trial and illustrates the mystic illuminism which served as a foundation for the imposture, as well as the slender amount of intellect required to satisfy the dupes.[1]

María de la Encarnacion was a bolder and more vulgar performer than her sister, but with an equally exhaustless imagination. She was utterly illiterate, unable even to read, but for months together she had *raptos vocales* every night in which she carried on conversations with heavenly personages. She furnished her admirers with beads which had been carried by the Virgin and were brought to her by St. Dominic. She announced that she was promised a great relic, and on emerging from an ecstasy she spat from her mouth a rag with a delicious odor of amber which was a piece of the shroud of Christ. She had bodily contests with the demon in which she was thrown upon the floor and otherwise maltreated, but finally came off victorious. Again, on recovering from a trance, she held in her hand a boar's tusk and explained that the devil had attacked her with his tusks, when she had broken this one off; on being asked how, if the devil was a spirit, he could have a material tusk, she replied that she did not know, unless it was the will of God. The tusk was found to be hollow and filled with horse-dung, but this in no way weakened the faith of her admirers. So implicit was this that Fray Cristóbal de la Cruz handed her a letter to be delivered

[1] This paper is as follows, *verbatim et literatim* :—"Hijo mio vien muestras el selo de tu selo al fin eres constituido por quien save tu ynterior y buena fe Lo que deves a ser al tiempo te lo ofrecera pero en lo actual si se ofreciera ocacion de la porqueria poner la mira en dios y alabandole selar la onrra de dios y ajustarse a lo que se a visto y oydo y a la mocion ynterior y conformandose siempre con esto Resistir a la emulacion y a los que pretendieren derocar las obras de dios afirmando siempre de su potencia mayores grandeças de las que hasta oy se an visto en el mundo sin aplauço del ynstrumentillo pues en si no es nada."

to the Virgin: of this the original, written with touching devotion, is among the papers of the case, with its sealed envelope, duly addressed *A la qui es virgen y madre.*[1] She had a whole squadron of angels in attendance on her; they asked her to procure diadems for them, which she did, whereat they rejoiced greatly and expressed their gratitude in delicious songs. Once or twice when Bruñon, who became her confessor, administered communion to her, the corporale, or cloth covering the wafer, and the purificatory with which the cup was wiped, were miraculously stained with blood. Bruñon kept these as priceless relics and the fact assumed in the eyes of the Inquisition the dimensions of a sacrilege. These few details will sufficiently illustrate the character of the endless series of wonders with which she amused her believers.

In the prosecution of Bruñon there is a list of the parties against whom his testimony is to be used. It comprises every one whose name is alluded to in his evidence as in any way concerned with the sisters, even including some fictitious "spiritual brethren" of María, scattered in hermitages in the Thebaïd and the mountains of Spain and Mexico. In all it amounts to seventy individuals, embracing members of all the Orders, Dominican, Franciscan, Jesuit, Carmelite, etc., numerous church dignitaries and secular priests, and even the janitor of the Holy Office. As there were thirty-one witnesses in the case of Josepha, doubtless each of them furnished

[1] *A la qui es virgen y madre.*

Serenissima Reina del sieolo y de la tierra. por pareserme buena ocasion esta os presento este memorial. aunque estoi mui sierto que lo que os quiero desir y pedir en el lo saveis bos misma mui buen mas por que se que gustais que os pida cosas dinas de buestra bondad y noblesa pedire y hablare con bos en esta aunque sea polvo y senisa. y asi os pido mi sen^ra^ y mi rreina por mersed que me alcanseis hanbre y sed de dios.—Lo segundo que se haga en mi su santa boluntad.—Lo tercero continuo silensio altos pensamientos y la union con dios amor y dejacion de todo que no es dios.

Buestro sierbo y esclavo que en serla esta mi dicha

[Flourish in place of signature.]

additional accomplices, and as this occurred in the trial of each of the parties implicated the prosecution must have extended over a considerable portion of the population of the city, giving to the inquisitors opportunity of making their power felt and of gathering in a large sum for expenses.

There was of course no lack of evidence as to the performances of the sisters, whose crazy utterances were repeated in endless iteration by successive witnesses. An exposure of the imposture, a public dishonoring penance for the performers, and a warning reprimand for the credulity of the dupes, would have been a public service which could have been accomplished in two or three months, for there was nothing specially heretical in the exhibitions of the women and they had recommended mortifications of the flesh, prayers and masses, confession and communion, and other pious works. This, however, was not the way of the Inquisition. The documents are fragmentary; of the trials of the sisters only a portion of that of Josepha has reached us, but from some allusions in that of Bruñon it is probable that they promptly confessed the fraud and implicated him as a confederate, yet nearly eight years were consumed after their arrest, September 9, 1649, before they were brought from prison and penanced in the *auto de fé* of July 9, 1657—eight years of solitary confinement and agonizing uncertainty. In April, 1649, the Inquisition had celebrated a great *auto*, in which 106 victims appeared, in person or in effigy; its prisons were thus relieved and it was in no haste to empty them again.

Bruñon's fate was even harder, although his trial never advanced to a point in which he was informed of the charges against him, for this was only done when a prosecution was nearing its end, and until then the prisoner was only urged to confess and was left to divine what it was that his judges wanted him to admit. When first arrested his self-assertive vanity led him to maintain the reality of the visions as divine manifestations, while prudently expressing his readiness to submit to the decision of the Church. His ardor soon cooled

and he began to cast around for methods to placate his judges and accommodate himself to what he conjectured to be their desire. He thus admitted that the sisters had deceived him and that their trances were the work of demons. After two months of imprisonment, November 12, 1649, he called God to witness that he had never suspected anything wrong and wound up by withdrawing whatever he might have written or said deviating from the doctrine of the Church as defined by this tribunal, to which he submitted himself unreservedly. Ten days later he presented a written statement or confession 105 pages in length, giving excuses for having allowed himself to be deceived, praising the superior penetration of the inquisitors which had enabled them to detect the fraud, and fairly grovelling at their feet in his despairing appeals for mercy. Two months and a half in his solitary cell, with the awful uncertainties of the future hanging over him, had thoroughly subdued his unstable and effervescing temperament. Had he been a confederate and not a dupe there can be no doubt that he would have admitted it, or even, if he had been told of what he was accused, that he would have promptly confessed it.

Whether he was innocent or guilty made little difference. The terrible patience of the Inquisition knew by experience the effectiveness of the slow torture of delay and suspense during which the wretched prisoner was wearing out brain and heart in dread uncertainty as days and weeks rolled by. On January 25, 1650, Bruñon was brought before the tribunal to ratify his testimony and after that audience he was allowed to lie in his cell as though forgotten. It did not take long for this strain to produce its effect on a mind so unbalanced and gifted with so little substantial power of resistance. February 22 he asked an audience to present a paper consisting of pitiful repetitions of arguments to prove his credulous good faith, in which the inconsistencies and the adjurations for mercy breathe the accents of despair. His reason was fast weakening and on March 8 he procured an-

other audience in which he declared that for the last eighteen months he had been possessed by a demon—ever since Josepha had told him that he was persecuted by one. Since then he had always felt it and it was now in his cell: the day before while walking it had given him a fillip on the forehead and he had heard a noise. He begged for help, and at the same time he presented a formal written criminal accusation against the demon as the malicious author of all his troubles. He was so evidently becoming crazed with solitude and despair that the inquisitors kindly ordered another prisoner, not connected with the case, to be placed in his cell in order to give him companionship. This somewhat relieved the immediate persecution of the demon, but his thoughts still ran in the same groove, and on June 20 he presented a long and rambling argument to prove that he had not been a free agent or accountable for his actions in consequence of being under diabolical influence. The same influence, he said, caused the witnesses to forget or to give erroneous evidence. Then for seven months he remained quietly brooding, until January 18, 1651, he submitted a short paper to show, from some biblical texts, that of old God had permitted demons to vex the faithful, which he seemed to think might help his case. After this an interval of sixteen months of unbroken solitude occurred during which incessant musing over his impending fate produced its inevitable result on his distempered brain. After asking for a Bible he labored for five weeks on a document of ninety-six pages, which he presented to the tribunal on May 27, 1652. In this he quotes innumerable texts to show that his case was predestined and that all the prophecies find their accomplishment in him: in fact it would seem that all the prophets and apostles had written principally to prefigure his fate in the minutest details. The necessity of God, he says, has thus governed his actions since birth and has prevented his enjoyment of free-will. Mingled with these arguments are bitter attacks on his persecutors. He quotes the biblical denunciations of unjust judges and

unrighteous men and applies them to the Inquisition. It is a congregation of demons, opposed to God and the faith; it is the most execrable abomination of Satan; all its words and acts are fraud, impiety, injustice and iniquity. Yet it is only the tool of the Jesuits, who are the most detestable enemies of God on earth: they are heretics, and in supporting them and executing their vengeance the Inquisition becomes a fautor of heresy. He calls upon all good Christians to take up arms against the Inquisition and the Jesuits, and upon the viceroy to give him an opportunity to defend the Holy Ghost against their attacks. The Holy Ghost had referred his case to the pope, who had sent instructions by the fleet reaching Vera Cruz the previous September, but the inquisitors had persistently disregarded them.

Whatever might otherwise have been the fate of Bruñon this shriek of crazy despair settled it. Yet the impassible inquisitors took no immediate notice of it. For two years more the miserable man lay in his cell, his reason gradually becoming more unhinged. At length on July 23, 1654, he obtained an audience for the purpose of protesting that, for the reasons alleged in his previous paper, the proceedings in his case were null and void. He also appealed to the royal power to take action against a person whom he stated to have been sent by the pope and king to take him out of prison. This person had been in Mexico for three months without performing his duty and should be prosecuted as a fautor of Antichrist and enemy of Christianity. The Bible, he added, shows that the pope is to make him a cardinal, and in due time he will cite the texts that prove it. Then there followed a year and three-quarters of absolute solitude, broken only in August, 1655, by a brief audience in which he was solemnly warned to relieve his conscience by confession—though still he was not informed as to what he was expected to confess. Finally, on April 26, 1656, after six years and seven months of immurement, he begged an audience in his cell, as he was too sick to appear before the tribunal. An inquisitor pro-

ceeded there when the poor wretch begged to be put to death or to be liberated, or at least to be allowed a brief breathing space in the court-yard. Seven years ago, he said, he had been seized with illness; since Christmas this had recurred and the pain allowed him neither to eat nor to sleep. He refused the offer of a companion in his cell, and, when a physician was suggested, he said that it would no him no good as the trouble arose from demons within him and without. Again he was urged to discharge his conscience by telling the whole truth, and to pray to God for support. On leaving the cell the inquisitor sent to him the official physician, Dr. Monrroy, who reported him to be suffering from melancholia and hypochondriasis which commonly end in acute madness; besides, he had fever resulting from anxiety and insomnia. Through a mistake he was brought before the tribunal the next day, when the opportunity was improved to scold him sharply for his fictions and for his audacity in interpreting Scripture. He answered wildly and said that his sickness was not of the body but came from the spirits which molested him.

The last scene of the prolonged tragedy was close at hand. In the afternoon the keeper of the prison reported that Bruñon refused to take the prescriptions of the physician; if they would give him half a chicken at noon, he said, and another in the evening it would be better. Two days later, on the 29th, Dr. Monrroy brought word at nightfall that Bruñon was dying and should have the sacraments at once. In haste two friars were sent for and instructed to make him confess if possible; after this they might administer the sacraments and exorcise him if necessary. At 9 P. M. they reported that he obstinately asserted that he had no need of the sacraments or of confession, that they wearied him and should take themselves off. They were ordered to make another attempt in the early morning, and at 9 A. M. they came to the tribunal with news that the pertinacious and despairing heretic, worse than an atheist, was just dead. The sorely tormented soul

had at last escaped from its torturers and the heretic body was thrust into the ground in a corner of the court-yard.

Thus Bruñon had been slowly driven to desperation, madness and death by nearly seven years of incarceration during which, under the infernal inquisitorial system, his formal trial had not even been begun. All that had as yet gone on was merely preliminary. No indictment or act of accusation had as yet been drawn up; he had not been informed of what he was accused; he had been repeatedly summoned to confess and had racked his brain to find out what was wanted of him and to devise the humblest and most grovelling forms of submission to the Church and to the Inquisition. When this failed to obtain relief from his pitiless solitude, the overwrought brain gave way, and in despairing madness he gave utterance to the accumulated bitterness which furnished ample justification for his eventual condemnation.

A year more passed away before the Inquisition was ready to proceed with his formal trial. The death of a prisoner made no difference, for his body, his memory and his estate were always subject to inquisitorial jurisdiction, and the only effect of dying was to deprive him of the possibility of confessing and asking for reconciliation to the Church. Otherwise it was an unimportant incident in the process, and on May 11, 1657, the fiscal, or prosecuting officer, presented an informal accusation for the purpose of summoning the relatives of the deceased to defend him if they saw proper. This was the first formulation of the crimes alleged against him. It stated that he was an alumbrado heretic, and although he had submitted himself to the Church this was evidently fictitious because he had subsequently burst forth into abominable heresies, proclaiming himself a Lutheran, a Donatist, a Sacramentarian, uttering blasphemies against the Church, the sacraments, the redemption purchased with the blood of the Savior, the purity of the Virgin, the canonization of the saints, the councils and decisions of the Holy See, and many other most detestable errors. As he is dead in his obstinacy

the fiscal claims that his name shall be blotted from the face of the earth, that his memory and fame be obliterated from the memory of man, and that his crimes be made manifest and be duly punished.[1]

As was customary in cases of prosecution of the dead, proclamation was made calling on his kindred to defend him. After some delay his brother, Juan Bruñon de Vertiz, an officer stationed at Vera Cruz, retained advocates for the purpose, but the defence was of course impossible and seems not to have been seriously sustained. At the great *auto de fé* of November, 1659, ten years after his incarceration, his effigy clad in priestly garments was solemnly brought forward; the ceremony of degradation from holy orders was performed; the vestments were stripped off and it was clothed in a secular dress; it was cast to the ground and kicked in token of contempt and detestation; the *sanbenito* was put on and it was consigned to the flames together with the bones which had been duly exhumed from their unconsecrated grave. The Inquisition had driven him into madness and heresy and then wreaked its vengeance on his remains for the edification of the people.

It might seem that this example would prove sufficiently deterrent, but while this case was dragging its length along the Inquisition had another on its hands, in 1652, of a certain Gerónima de Obregon who had visions and revelations and who claimed to have borne a child without pain in consequence of having drunk the blood of Christ. She also died in prison, and the Inquisitor Manosca kindly purchased a plenary indulgence for the benefit of her soul, showing that she must have confessed and been reconciled on her deathbed.[2]

These were doubtless succeeded by many more whose records have not reached us. The next Mexican case that happens to have been preserved illustrates fairly the profitable aspect of the profession. For some twelve years or more a

[1] See Appendix.

[2] MSS. of David Fergusson, Esq.

peddler named Francisco Fernandez exploited the charitable zeal of the public and boasted that he earned ten or twelve reals a day, sufficient to support his modest existence and that of his wife and three children. He had ecstasies and visions, he had sucked the milk of the Virgin and blood from the wounds of Christ; he was sanctified and in a state of grace. When a merchant named Juan Luis had a bad leg he pronounced that there were eleven legions of devils in it and drove them out by spitting on it. For a few reals he would pray souls out of purgatory into heaven and could tell the exact hour at which they winged their way to the presence of God. All this was harmless enough, but he sometimes made a nuisance of himself during divine service by uncontrollable ardor, showing itself in bellowings like a bull or in shouts of *Fuego del amor de Dios, Viva Jesus*, etc., for which he was frequently ejected from the churches. He had a little knot of disciples, including some ecclesiastics, to whom he discoursed with much unction on the love of God, and for many years no one seems to have thought it worth while to disturb him in his vocation. At length, in March, 1694, he was denounced to the Inquisition, which for more than two years continued to collect evidence against him, had it carefully verified and analyzed and submitted it to the *calificadores*, who had no hesitation in pronouncing him an *alumbrado* impostor, suspect of heresy. On July 12, 1696, the Inquisition issued a mandate for his arrest and the sequestration of his property, but when the alguazil proceeded to his residence he was met with the information that the culprit had quietly died on the previous May 3, and had been buried with all honor in a chapel of the church of San Agustin. There could have been no property to reward prosecution against his memory and his bones were left undisturbed.[1]

[1] Proceso de Francisco Fernandez (MSS. of David Fergusson, Esq.).

The summary of evidence submitted to the junta of *calificadores* in this case gives a tolerably fair view of the doings of this class of mystics. It will be found in the Appendix.

Mexico was not the only scene of these pious frauds in the New World. The Inquisition of Lima also had occasionally to deal with *beatas revelanderas*, who were doubtless stimulated by the reputation of the Lily of Quito, the Blessed Mariana de Jesus. In the *auto de fé* of March 16, 1693, there appeared Angela de Olivitos y Esquinel, popularly known as *la Hermana Angela de Cristo*, a young woman of 28, by trade a sempstress, who was prosecuted as an impostor and a Quietist alumbrada. She had the customary ecstasies, visions and revelations, and was said to have borne a child while making professions of the highest sanctity. She was mercifully treated with five years of reclusion in a convent, and was warned to have nothing further to do with revelations.[1]

At the *auto* of December 20 in the following year, 1694, there was a culprit of higher renown whose career is worth examining in some detail as a revelation of the illimitable superstition on which these practitioners could safely speculate. Angela Carranza was born in 1641 at Córdoba del Tucuman. She seems to have been a woman of considerable natural capacity, improved by education, and if, as she finally confessed, she had been guilty of irregularities in youth, this served to sharpen her intelligence and to give her increased audacity in trading on the weaknesses of her fellows. Vivacious, self-reliant, shameless and ready with brain and tongue, she had all the qualities requisite for the career which she followed with such success. She came to Lima in 1665 and soon acquired the reputation of a beata blessed with unusual favors from God. She professed to inflict upon herself twelve hundred lashes daily and to fast through the whole year, she never had less than two ecstasies per diem and often more. About 1673 she commenced to write out her revelations, but soon transferred the task to her spiritual directors, and at the time of her arrest in 1689 these inspired

[1] Documentos Literarios del Perú, T. VII. p. 369 (Lima, 1876).

utterances amounted to fifteen thousand closely written pages.

Her reputation became universal among all classes from the highest to the lowest, in both Church and State, not alone in Lima but throughout the kingdom of Peru, which then comprehended all the Spanish possessions in South America except New Granada, and she was even regarded with reverence in Spain. In the shops and market-place few dared to refuse her request for anything that struck her fancy, for she had a fashion of predicting evil to those who offended her which brought the boldest to terms. Once on hearing that a man had spoken of her as an impostor, she said to him "Let those who speak ill of me look to their souls, for they will shortly die." Stricken with fear he sought one of her spiritual directors and asked him to inquire of her the grounds of her assertion, as he was a Christian and desired to prepare himself for death. The good padre made the inquiry and reported to him "Señor, arrange your affairs, for since Angela has said it, it must be so." He went at once to confession and on his return home found his family in despair. His wife went to Angela and begged her to intercede with God for him, which she promised to do, and the next day husband and wife carried to her fifty pesos under pretext of her employing them in masses for his soul, besides giving her a costly jewel of emeralds which she had previously begged of him in vain to deck the image on her altar. She was, in fact, constantly appealed to for her prayers in business affairs of importance and doubtful conjunctures, voyages, marriages, and the countless incidents of life, as well as in cases of sickness and for the salvation of the dead. She was shrewd and thrifty and sold her influence with God at a full price. A merchant lost a large number of silver bars in a river and could not identify the spot in which they lay. He applied to her and offered her a hundred pesos; she demanded two hundred, which he finally agreed to give if the silver was recovered, whereupon she made him sign an agreement to

that effect. When the dry season came the waters fell; he found his silver and at a cost of six thousand pesos rescued it. As soon as she heard of it she claimed payment; he endeavored to put her off on the ground that the bullion had not yet reached him, but she clamored and threatened till he paid it. As a woman of business she kept an account of her receipts, and in it were found entries of one or two thousand pesos in single items.

She also drove a thriving trade in carrying to heaven all sorts of objects—chiefly beads and rosaries, but also bells, swords, daggers, veils, etc.—and having them blessed by God, and she announced that those who did not believe in them would be damned with Judas. Some beads in addition she sent by St. Michael to the pope who conceded plenary indulgences to them. The beads had virtues of different kinds according to the saint's day on which she took them to heaven. Those of St. Jerome would convert the infidel, of St. Joseph would preserve chastity, of St. Michael would guard a house against robbers, of St. John would protect from the plague and heart disease, of St. Andrew would prevent insanity. Special graces attached to those blessed by God on Michaelmas 1680; the possessors would have the blessing of Jacob, be blessed in life and in death, die without pain and their souls be effectually guarded from Satan. Two or three of these precious beads were treasured in the sacristy of the church of San Marcelo, so that rosaries could be touched with them and carried to the dying, to whom they communicated the *auxilio eficáz*. God granted similar virtues to her shoes, and the pious eagerly sought for her old foot-gear, which was regarded as priceless. Even her nail-parings were preserved in silver reliquaries and she distributed small fragments of stone to sailors as a preservative against shipwreck. The natural result of all this we are told was to harden sinners in their evil ways, for they relied upon the virtue of her beads and relics, persevered in a life of crime, and neglected confession and communion. When finally the Inquisition

commanded the surrender of all these objects they were brought in panniers full, especially beads and rosaries, until they filled a room.

She claimed that it had been revealed to her that she had been confirmed in grace and sanctified like John the Baptist and could not sin. God had given her, as guardian angel, Laurel Aureo, the same one who had attended David, and she was under the special inspiration of the Holy Ghost, the Virgin, St. Michael, St. Raphael and innumerable angels, apostles and doctors of the Church. She was not strictly consistent in these matters, for at another time she called herself the daughter of the Father, the mother of the Son, the bride of the Holy Ghost and the sacristy of the Trinity. Moreover she was the great angel of the Apocalypse and would appear in Rome and procure the papal confirmation of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception. Her disciples had paintings made of her in this character, with wings extended and her foot on the dragon of Original Sin.

The intense craving among Spaniards for the authoritative definition of the Immaculate Conception probably explains in part the success of her impostures, for she was shrewd enough to present herself as its ardent champion, even scolding the popes with scant ceremony for their delay in confirming it; she would teach, she said, the pope his A B C in the matter. She saw the demons in hell wearing Dominicans as mantles because the Dominicans were *maculistæ* and denied the dogma. In her revelations, which she wrote with a quill from the wing of the Holy Ghost, she constantly recurs to this subject: these revelations, she said, were the explanation of those of María de Agreda, which were obscure and theological while hers were plain and clear. Extravagant as we have seen María's speculations to be, Angela's were even wilder. In her zeal for the Virgin she virtually divinized Anna and Joachim. The Holy Ghost had descended upon them and purified them of Original Sin and its consequences, so that they were as pure as Adam and Eve before the Fall:

he had moreover clothed them with the splendor of divinity, and Gabriel brought them the fruit of the Tree of Life, which was nothing else than the substance of Christ himself. They were united with God, they were transformed into God and God into them, and thus the Virgin was not only conceived sinless but was consubstantial with Christ. In fact, with details that can well be spared, she proved that Anna conceived not only Mary but Christ, Christ being thus engendered by man and not by the Holy Ghost. After Mary's birth the Holy Ghost transferred Christ from Anna to Mary. Joseph was not the husband of Mary but only her majordomo. He never recognized the divinity of Christ and always regarded Mary as a penitent sinner.

Crazy as all this may seem, it was as nothing to the stories which she poured forth in endless profusion, to be duly written down by her confessors, of her daily intercourse with all the powers supernal and infernal. The vulgar and blasphemous familiarity of this even exceeds the revelations of the Blessed Mariana de Jesus. She dances to amuse Christ who nearly dies of laughter, she sucks the breasts of the Virgin, Christ makes love to her and the angels sing malicious little songs about it. With Satan she is on terms equally intimate and learns from him many mysteries of the faith—a fact of which the Inquisition took advantage to accuse her of entering into a pact, express and implied, with the demon. On one occasion she quelled a rebellion in hell which Satan was unable to subdue because she had previously crippled him; on another she made the demons arrange a choir and sing hymns to the Virgin and St. Anna on Tuesdays and Saturdays; she often went there to see that they did it and found that they performed excellently. These were by no means the most remarkable of her experiences with the powers of the upper and nether worlds; in fact, there were some which are unfit to repeat, for she was personally shameless and had no scruples in inventing and reciting stories of herself, the

grossness of which appears simply incredible to our modern sense of decency.

It was on a coarse and vulgar imposture such as this that the credulity of Peru fed for nearly twenty-five years. It was open and public, yet during all this time the Inquisition looked calmly on and saw nothing in it contrary to faith or morals. Had she died during this time she would have left the reputation of a miracle-working saint, and efforts would have been made to canonize her like Mariana de Jesus—efforts which she herself expected and confidently asserted would be successful if enough money could be raised to satisfy the curia. Probably her career might have been prolonged indefinitely, for there is no record of any special cause for the ultimate interference of the Inquisition, had she been wise enough to restrain her satirical mood. She had a keen eye for the sins and weaknesses of others, especially of ecclesiastics; in her revelations she had no scruple in mentioning them by name and commenting on their offences. She was especially bitter against those who did not reverence her, and her ill word was a blight upon a career, for the foremost men of the land regarded her as the greatest saint the Church had possessed and listened to her utterances as prophecies and oracles from heaven. It is easy to imagine that hostility thus gathered strength until her enemies ventured to denounce her to the Inquisition. When once she and her writings were in the hands of the dread tribunal, the enormous bulk of the evidence was the only trouble, and the theologians had no difficulty in pronouncing her revelations to be heretical, erroneous, dangerous, blasphemous, audacious, false, scandalous, irreverent, insulting and defamatory to her neighbors.

She was arrested December 21, 1689, and her trial lasted five years. For a long while she steadfastly maintained the truth of her divine graces; under examination she answered all questions with dexterity, boldness and freedom; she asserted that her intercourse with heavenly personages con-

tinued in her cell; towards the close of her trial, when twice threatened with torture, they visited her, comforted her, and assured her that she would not be subjected to it. In fact, it does not seem to have been employed, but it doubtless would have been had she not suddenly, on June 2, 1694, requested an audience and made confession. This was framed with her customary astuteness. Through the medium of the Holy Office, she said, God had granted her light to detest the doctrines and propositions which she had written, and in which she now recognized that there were many heresies and blasphemies. For these she asked pardon, but she asserted that there was no deceit in her visions, for she had referred them to persons of virtue and learning, whom she enumerated, and whose opinions she had simply accepted; she had not intended to write them out but had been persuaded to do so by these persons. As for believing the visions and revelations, she had held herself in suspense, and now that the Inquisition had pronounced them false she begged pardon of the Lord and of her judges and admitted that she had been deceived.

The confession was imperfect, such as the Inquisition was not accustomed to be satisfied with, but the affair probably involved too many exalted personages for it to employ its wonted rigor, and, considering the impudence of the prolonged imposture, it treated her with singular leniency throughout. After appearing in the approaching *auto de fé* with a halter around the neck and abjuring *de vehementi*, she was to be relegated for four years to a convent, to fast on Fridays during the first year, to take the sacrament not oftener than once a month, not to wear the vestments of a beata or to call herself Angela de Dios, to be deprived of writing materials, to confess to a designated confessor, and to impart no more revelations. The mass of written ones was further ordered to be burnt. She duly appeared at the *auto de fé* of December 20, 1694, but the popular veneration had changed to indignation so bitter that the Inquisition did

not venture to let her walk in procession with the other penitents. She was smuggled to the place of celebration and when the ceremonies were over she was conveyed away in a closed carriage, accompanied by a layman and an ecclesiastic, but some boys discovered her and followed with showers of stones; a crowd speedily joined in pursuit, when a troop of soldiers was ordered up and in the collision a man was killed and many were wounded. The carriage reached the Inquisition at last, and its inmates were rescued half dead with fear and somewhat injured by stones. It was a month before the Inquisition ventured to send her to the place of her confinement, and during the interval the popular feeling spent itself in holding mock *autos de fé* in every quarter of the city, in which her effigy was sentenced and scourged and solemnly burnt. She is said to have died insane before her term of confinement expired, and Peruvian mothers to this day control unruly children with the dreaded name of Angela Carranza.[1]

An ample inquisitorial harvest could have been gathered from among her disciples, but the Holy Office seems to have been inclined to mercy throughout. As far as accessible records show there was only one other prosecution—that of Don Ignacio de Hijar y Mendoza, rector of the parish of San Marcelo. His offence consisted in having written down her heretical propositions and in declining by her advice a prebend in the cathedral. He defended himself with the argument that he was not the only confessor who had been deceived by her pretence of sanctity. If he had formed a high opinion of her spiritual graces it was in consequence of seeing the public acclaim with which she was greeted and the estimation in which she was held by the most eminent personages in the kingdom. By her advice he had abandoned all effort to advance himself and had devoted his labor and his means

[1] José de Hoyo, Relacion sumaria del Auto de Fé celebrado en Lima á 20 de Diciembre de 1694 (Documentos Literarios del Perú, T. VII. p. 287).—Palma, Anales de la Inquisicion de Lima. Lima, 1863, pp. 15, 21–22, 33.

to aid his parishioners and to restore his church. Harshness such as that visited on Joseph Bruñon de Vertiz would have well-nigh depopulated the churches of Lima and Don Ignacio was shortly released.[1]

Meanwhile in Spain the Inquisition pursued its work, though the absence of accessible documents prevents any complete recital of its labors. At the great *auto de fé* of 1680 in Madrid four culprits of this kind were penanced. Juan Antonio Costal was condemned as a hypocrite and impostor, his principal offence apparently being the claim that he was inspired by the spirit of San Vicente Ferrer. He cannot have been regarded as deeply criminal for he escaped with a threatening reprimand and confinement to the city of Toledo for three years, under surveillance of the Inquisition. Alfonso de Arenas, likewise a hypocrite and impostor, was more severely dealt with, receiving two hundred lashes through the streets, five years in the galleys at the oar without pay, and five years' subsequent banishment from Madrid, Toledo, Almagro, and Manzanares. Constanza Hernandez was condemned as a heretic, an *alumbrada* and an impostor, but she had died at the age of 70 in the inquisitorial prison of Córdoba, after repenting and receiving absolution, so her only sentence was confiscation and her bones were allowed Christian burial. Her daughter, Antonia Hernandez, aged 50, guilty in the same degree, had also died in the prison, but obstinate in her errors, so her effigy was brought forth and burnt with her bones.[2] The next year, at Córdoba two *alumbrados* figured among the penitents.[3] The persistent efforts of the Inquisition had evidently as yet not succeeded in putting an end to the extravagances of mysticism and its attendant pest of *beatas revelanderas*.

[1] Palma, pp. 33–4.

[2] Olmo, Relacion del Auto General de la Fee que se celebró en Madrid en presencia de sus magestades el dia 30 de Junio de 1680. Madrid, 1680 pp. 201, 203, 239, 247.

[3] Matute y Luquin, Coleccion de los Autos de Fé de Córdoba, p. 210.

MOLINISTAS.

The Jesuit victory over Molinos, recorded in the bull *Cœlestis Pastor* of Innocent XI., November 20, 1687, marks the definite adoption by the Church at large of the Spanish policy which had so long sought to suppress mystic exaggeration and had recognized the danger lurking in the self-satisfying independence of Illuminism and Quietism. The trial and condemnation of Molinos aroused universal interest and threw into the background the so-called heresies of the earlier mystics. Thenceforth the aberrations which had been attributed to the Alumbrados became usually known as Molinosism or Molinism. Papal authority now not only condemned the contemplation, so long regarded as holy, in which all thought and intellect were absorbed and lost, but it defined that the teachings which Molinos drew from the older mystics involved the conclusion that fleshly desires could be indulged without defiling the purity of the spirit, if the spirit remained passive and merely permitted Satan to have his way, such trials being sent by God to purify the spirit by humbling it.[1] Thus the accusations of illicit practices, so long brought against the Alumbrados, received the confirmation of the Holy See, and it was easy and effective to stigmatize with the name of Molinos whatever the Inquisition desired to suppress, whether spiritual striving for mystical perfection or imposture and immorality. It is to this that we may attribute the bitterness which the memory of the unfortunate Molinos excited. Even so learned and moderate a writer as Florez, nearly a century after the catastrophe, characterizes him as a monster of filth and blasphemy in his acts and writings, whose exterior sanctity was merely a mask for obscene sensuality.[2]

[1] Innocent. PP. XI. Bull. *Cœlestis Pastor*, §§ 21, 41–55 (Mag. Bullar. Rom. X. 214. Ed. Luxemb.).

[2] Henrique Florez, Clave Historial, Ed. XII. Madrid, 1786, p. 363.

Molinos was not formally condemned until September 3, 1687, but on the 15th of the previous February the Roman Inquisition had issued a circular letter to the prelates of Christendom instructing them to break up all associations of Quietists.[1] The mandates of the Roman Congregation had no currency in Spain, but this accorded so well with the predisposition of the Spanish Holy Office, which had already in 1677 condemned the book of Molinos, that it doubtless received a prompt confirmation and was transmitted without delay to the subordinate tribunals. It met with a speedy response, for, on April 24th, there was arrested at Seville Don Joseph Luis Navarro de Luna y Medina, a canon of the church of San Salvador. He was a man of position who, after dissipating a fortune brought by his father from the Indies, had entered the Church and acquired high standing as a spiritual director among the mystically inclined. He had written two books, the titles of which sufficiently indicate their import—the *Dispertador del Alma* and the *Luz de Luz divina*,[2] which he said, on his trial, had been suggested to him by Bishop Palafox's *Pastor de noche buena*. He had visions and revelations, and was a correspondent of Molinos, to whom he sent his autobiography in order to obtain from him fitting instructions as to his conduct. He had been accused of some imprudent practices in a convent of which he was the spiritual director and had been deprived of his licence as confessor, but this was restored to him by the Archbishop of Seville, Jayme de Palafox, who conceived so great an admiration for him that he introduced him in all the convents, adopted him as his own confessor and that of his family, and used to carry him with him in his coach.

There evidently were personal animosities at work, for in one of his books he had held up to public ridicule, under

[1] Bigelow, Molinos the Quietist, New York, 1882, p. 111.

[2] Both of these works are duly condemned in the 1707 Index of Vidal Marin, II. 19.

feigned names, two prominent ecclesiastics of Seville who had been active in depriving him of his confessor's licence. As a disciple of Palafox he naturally held the Jesuits in mortal enmity, and publicly denounced and mocked them. There was also a Dominican, Fray Pedro de Ulloa, known as the *Apostol del Rosario*, who welcomed the approaching condemnation of Molinos by preaching against his errors every Sunday for four months, and whom Navarro repaid with bitter words. When the instructions came from the Roman Congregation there could therefore be no lack of denunciations against him. He expected it and defiantly declared that the day of his arrest would be the happiest day of his life. The saints, he said, had suffered, and so must we.

This spirit of martyrdom enabled him to endure for four years, with wonderful constancy, the pains of incarceration and of the torture which was not spared him; but the capacity of the Inquisition to inflict rarely failed to wear out the capacity of endurance of its victims, and he succumbed at last, acknowledged the errors charged against him and sought reconciliation with the Church. He appeared, March 3, 1691, at a private *auto*, held before daybreak, to which twenty-four spectators were summoned, where his sentence consumed five hours in the reading. It declared him guilty of the heresies of the Lutherans, Calvinists, Arians, Nestorians, Trinitarians, Waldenses, Agapetæ, Baianists and Alumbrados, besides being a promulgator of those of Molinos. He was said to discard the use of images and deny the efficacy of indulgences. With regard to the immoral practices which formed the basis of the accusations against the Molinistas no specific charges seem to have been brought against him, and the Inquisition contented itself with asserting that to the Molinist theory of not rejecting evil thoughts while in prayer he added that, as soon as the prayer was finished, those evil thoughts should be put into execution; also, that in the assemblies of his disciples, held in his house, the lights would

be extinguished and he would teach doctrines too foul to be described.

Considering all this, and that he had increased his guilt by obstinacy and by establishing communication with other prisoners in the Inquisition, his sentence was remarkably mild. He was required to abjure, he was deprived of his benefices and functions, and was to be confined for two years in a religious house and banished for six more from the diocese of Seville and the city of Madrid. At first he was placed in the *Hermita de San Hermenegildo* at the Córdova gate, but he manifested complete indifference as to his fate and many of his disciples continued to visit him there for consolation, so he was removed to the Hospital of San Juan de Dios at Xeres. When his term of exile expired he returned to Seville; in 1700, at his instance, Archbishop Palafox procured from the Holy See what was known as a *Jubileo circular* —that in some church of the city every day the Host should be exposed to view. From that time to his death, in extreme old age, in 1725, Navarro passed his days in the churches where the sacrament was to be seen. With increasing infirmity he carried with him a hinged stool on which to sit, and no matter how distant the church might be he tottered to it and remained until the curtain was drawn over the monstrance. He was utterly penniless and lived upon such alms as the charitable might bestow, and when he died it was piously hoped that his exemplary closing years had won pardon for his errors.[1]

During Navarro's trial several of his disciples were arrested and condemned to various penances, and the instructions of

[1] This case apparently attracted considerable attention at the time, for in the municipal archives of Seville there are two unofficial relations of it (Seccion especial, Siglo XVIII., Letra A. Tomo IV. Nos. 48 y 49). Of these I give in the Appendix the shorter and less complete one. Allowing for the malignant rancor displayed by the writer, it shows how little was the difference between the doctrines ascribed to the Molinists and those of the great mystic saints of the sixteenth century.

the Roman Inquisition to break up the societies of Quietists were thoroughly obeyed. Seville, however, was even yet not purified of Molinism, for at an *auto* held May 18, 1692, there was penanced as an alumbrada and Molinista a woman named Ana Raguza, popularly known as *la pabeza*, who had come from Palermo as a missionary to convert the wicked. No immorality seems to have been charged against her, but she called herself a bride of Christ, she had visions and revelations, she denied the efficacy of masses and fasts, and could determine the condition of consciences by the sense of smell.[1] She was mercifully treated with reclusion for two years in a house of *beatas* and six years more of exile from the diocese of Seville and city of Madrid.

In Córdova, between 1693 and 1699, there were several *autos de fé* in which a Molinist and several *beatas embusteras* suffered.[2] The first real martyr of Molinism, however, seems to have been Juan de Causadas, a canon of Tudela, who disseminated the doctrines of mysticism with great enthusiasm. He can have been neither a hypocrite nor an impostor, for if he had been either he would have confessed and recanted and have escaped with the penance usually inflicted on such characters. His burning by the Inquisition of Logroño shows that he was a man of honest convictions who would not abandon them to save himself from a dreadful death.[3] A trial concluded in 1711 illustrates the fresh access of severity with which the Inquisition was now treating everything savoring of mystic offences. In 1708 the tribunal of Toledo arrested a *fraile* who seems to have been mystically inclined and to have encouraged *recojimiento* among those under his charge. This led to a number of prosecutions among which was one of which the record has been preserved. Pedro

[1] Archivo Municipal de Sevilla, Seccion especial, Siglo XVIII. Letra A, Tomo 4, No. 51.

[2] Matute y Luquin, pp. 211, 213.

[3] Llorente, IV. 33. — Llorente takes the orthodox unfavorable view of Molinos and of those who were classed as his disciples.

Pablo Diez, an apothecary of Yepes, was one of the disciples of the accused, and as soon as he heard of the arrest of his confessor he hastened before the Inquisition to make confession. Since 1702 he had practised *recojimiento* and the incorporation of his soul with God, and had been blessed with almost constant trances, visions and revelations, which he had committed to writing and sent to his confessor. Their seizure among the papers of the latter formed the basis of the prosecution. There is nothing among them trenching in the least on Molinism, or which in the sixteenth century would not have been regarded as completely orthodox, except a revelation commanding him to ask a friend to pray for the death of his father-in-law in order that the inheritance might enable him, his wife and his daughters to pay the expenses attendant on entering a religious Order. On his first examination he eagerly retracted whatever he might through ignorance have committed against the faith and begged for mercy. He was soon brought to confess that his visions and revelations were fictitious in order to obtain reputation, and there is no allusion to his having used them speculatively for gain, but in his over-anxiety to satisfy his judges he contradicted himself several times and was easily entangled in theological subtleties which enabled them finally to convict him of formal heresy, although repentant. A century earlier a couple of years' reclusion in a convent would have been meted out for such an offence, but in his sentence, rendered September 27, 1711, he was told that he had incurred the death penalty but was mercifully let off with confiscation, the wearing of the *sanbenito* and imprisonment for life.[1] Less severe, but still harsh, was the punishment at Granada in 1716 of Francisca Teresa Martin, whose popular name of *La Beata de las Llagas* shows that she boasted of the stigmata; she was sentenced to two hundred lashes, four years in a house of correction (*las Recojidas*) and four additional years

[1] MSS. of the Königl. Universitäts Bibliothek of Halle, Yc. 20, T. XI.

of banishment.[1] A more notable victim was Joseph Fernandez de Toro, Bishop of Oviedo, who was condemned to imprisonment as a Molinist. In 1716 his case was evoked to Rome by Clement XI. Philip V. acquiesced in what Philip II. had so energetically resisted in the case of Carranza; Toro was carried to Rome where he was confined in the Castle of Sant'Angelo and deposed from the episcopate in 1721.[2]

While this case was dragging to its conclusion the Inquisition of Córdova had the luck to discover an association of *Molinistas alumbrados* entrenched in the Dominican convent of San Pablo. At its head was a *beata* named Isabel del Castillo, wife of Miguel de Herrera, who claimed that her body was the same as that of Christ in the sacrament and that she held the Trinity in her belly. At her baptism the Virgin had presented her to the Father; her marriage with Christ had been celebrated in heaven, with Christ himself as the celebrant, St. Peter acting as deacon, St. Francis as subdeacon, and St. Paul preaching the sermon. Christ had sent her to redeem the world; her disciples were required to abandon to her their free-will and all their faculties; they had no need of fasts and penances but could throw all their sins upon her, and the path to salvation lay through sensual indulgence. Her mission was said to be proved by many miracles wrought with the aid of demons. Four Dominicans of high standing in San Pablo were her chief disciples, besides whom she had others among the laity of the better class. Seven in all were penanced at the *auto* of April 24, 1718, Isabel herself being sentenced to two hundred lashes and perpetual imprisonment, the friars to perpetual imprisonment, and the rest to exile for various terms.[3]

The turn of the Franciscans soon came. In 1727 Fray

[1] Menendez y Pelayo, III. 95.

[2] Llorente, IV. 33.—Rousset, Histoire de la Cour de Madrid, Cologne, 1719, p. 251.

[3] Matute y Luquin, pp. 216–23.

Manuel de Val and the nuns of the convent of Casbas were condemned for improper relations maintained under the pretext of spiritual perfection.[1] We have more details of another case occurring about this time in which the Inquisition of Llerena had to deal with Fray Francisco de la Parra, a Franciscan of high reputation for sanctity, who had been guardian of the convents of Burguellos, Fuente del Maestre and Fuente del Cantos. He was accused of seducing his penitents and of teaching them that impurity far from being sinful was union with God. Thirty-four had been thus tempted, many of whom had fallen. His favorite was Sor María del Espíritu Santo whom he commonly called Negreta, and who had visions in which she visited heaven and hell and released souls by the million. For five years he lay in the Inquisition and would not admit that his Negreta was not a saint. Finally he was induced to confess and ask for reconciliation, but it was thought that his repentance was feigned and that he still believed there had been nothing sinful in his course. Bearing in mind the inquisitorial methods of obtaining information from frightened nuns we may perhaps doubt whether his case was as black as it appears from the proceedings. He was condemned to a circular scourging inflicted by all the friars of the convent of Llerena, to be deprived of all priestly functions, to be shut up for ten years in a cell which he was to leave only for divine service, and to Friday fasting on bread and water.[2] In 1735 at Granada Fray Juan de San Estéban, a Jeronymite, aged 74, appeared in an *auto de fé* with Luisa Antonia de Enzinas, known as the Beata de Torroz, as his accomplice. They were condemned for Molinism and impurity, and as he is spoken of as a heresiarch he probably had been engaged in propagating his opinions.[3]

Santa Teresa's Order of Barefooted Carmelites did not

[1] Menendez y Pelayo, III. 94.
[2] Barrantes, Aparato, II. 357–60.
[3] Menendez y Pelayo, III. 95.

escape and became the scene of a fearful scandal. Based on ascetic mysticism, the traditions of the Order doubtless rendered its members zealous in the practices which had won for its founder the honor of canonization, and when mysticism had become Molinism we can readily imagine that the Inquisition eagerly took advantage of any opportunity to discredit them. The tragedy of Doña Agueda de Luna, commonly known as Madre Agueda, is excedingly obscure and the truth will probably never be ascertained, but the ferocity with which the inquisitors of Logroño pursued their investigations and the character of the evidence adduced cast an unpleasant doubt upon the guilt which was so severely punished. There evidently was fraud and there may have been licentiousness, but there was also vindictive exaggeration and stupid cruelty.

In 1712 Madre Agueda entered the Carmelite convent of Lerma with a reputation for sanctity already acquired. For twenty years she lived there with that reputation constantly growing through the reports of her ecstasies and miracles, which are said to have been adroitly spread by those who were discovered to be her confederates. One of these was Fray Juan de Longas, Carmelite prior of Lerma, a nephew of the Canon Juan de Causadas burnt at Logroño as a Molinist, and an ardent propagator of the same errors throughout Navarre, Rioja, Búrgos and Soria. His career was cut short in 1729 when the Inquisition of Logroño condemned him to the severe punishment of two hundred lashes, ten years in the galleys and then to perpetual imprisonment. Another of Madre Agueda's so-called confederates was Fray Juan de la Vega, Provincial of the Carmelites, who had been her spiritual director since 1715. His reputation for sanctity was such that he was known as *El Ecstático*, and it was said that there had been none like him in Spain since San Juan de la Cruz. He wrote a life of Madre Agueda in which her numerous miracles were fully set forth.

About 1732 a new Carmelite convent was founded at Cor-

ella and Madre Agueda was made prioress. Soon the whole country around was accustomed to flock to her for succor and intercession with God, and her reputation for holiness was constantly spreading. The most damning fact in her case is that she was wont to cure the sick by giving out small flat stones marked with a cross on one side and a star on the other, made of pounded brick. These she pretended to pass from the bladder with all the pains of childbirth and they were eagerly sought as precious health-giving relics. It is the one positively ascertainable fact concerning her, for Llorente tells us that his parents, who lived a couple of leagues from Corella, carried to her a sick child, when she gave them one of these stones, in spite of which the child soon died.

At last, after a long career of reputed sanctity, Madre Agueda was denounced to the Inquisition of Logroño as a Molinist. She was arrested with her nuns, as well as Juan de la Vega, his successor in the provincialate, the secretary of the Carmelites and two *frailes*. It looked as though the heresy was penetrating throughout Santa Teresa's Order. If this was so the inquisitors were determined to root it out at any cost and their methods were at least effective if cruel. Torture was employed unsparingly. Madre Agueda perished under it in her preliminary examinations, before her case was prepared for trial, but she had been made to confess all that was wanted of her. It casts some doubt upon the extent of her real delinquency to find that among other crimes she admitted invoking the demon and signing a written pact with him, in which she adored him as the Almighty and renounced Christ. That she had led a dissolute life with Fray Juan de Vega may be true if the evidence is to be believed that she bore him five children and that their bones were found in the spot indicated as their burial-place; but incredulity is a duty with regard to the testimony of her niece, Doña Vicente de Loya, who had been admitted to the convent at the age of nine and who swore that her aunt had trained her to evil and had held her while Juan de la Vega violated her, in

order, as she said, that the act might be more meritorious in the eyes of God. Juan de la Vega, in spite of his advanced age, heroically endured the extremity of torture and denied all these allegations, although he candidly admitted that he had, as provincial, received payment for 11,800 masses which had never been celebrated. All the other Carmelite *frailes* and officials likewise underwent torture without confession, nor is it likely, in view of the fate of Madre Agueda, that it was sparingly applied. Four sisters of the convent were also tortured, of whom only one could be brought to confess, and she said that she had been taught the evil doctrines by Fray Juan de Longas. Against this may be set the other nuns, who had formed an antagonistic faction in the convent, and who, as Llorente tells us, deposed to a mass of incredible things, unnecessary to repeat. Many witnesses moreover were found to swear that Fray Juan de la Vega had entered into a pact with the demon.

At the *auto de fé* held at Logroño in 1743, Fray Juan de la Vega was relegated to the desert convent of Duruelo, where he soon died. The other *frailes* were sent to convents in Majorca, Bilbao, Valladolid and Osma. The annalist of the Order was the only one who confessed, and he thus escaped the shame of wearing the *sanbenito*, as did likewise Doña Vicente de Loya, for the same reason. The inculpated nuns were distributed among other convents, and the house of Corella was filled with sisters from other places. Llorente adds that the archives of the Inquisition were filled with cases of similar disorders in convents too indecent to be made public.[1] This I can well believe from the character of some of those occurring in Mexico which I have consulted.

It was probably the affair of Madre Agueda which led the Inquisition in 1745 to issue a special edict directed against five Molinist errors.[2] By this time, however, the definition

[1] Llorente, IV. 33–9.

[2] There is an allusion to this edict in the *Relacion de la causa de don Pedro Fernandez Ybarraran* (MSS. of David Fergusson, Esq.), but the only error

of Molinism had become so elastic that it could be applied to almost any aberration. In the trial of Dr. Agustin Tamarit, before the Inquisition of Barcelona in 1757, for heretical speeches, one of the charges was that he had said that "the Moors were wealthy, prosperous and in the enjoyment of plentiful rain, directly the reverse of us Christians, and concluded by saying 'What remains for us but to join the Moors?' On another he asserted that it was better to be bad than good, as good people were generally poor and bad ones rich." On this the decision of the *calificadores* was "The first part of this proposition is scandalous, savoring of Molinism and apostasy. The last is heretical."[1]

There probably was Molinism involved in the case of María de Lara, penanced at Córdova in the *auto* of July 13, 1749. Her errors were so numerous that the sentence consumed four hours and a half in the reading, but the only one specifically mentioned in the account which has reached us is that she conceived and gave birth to Christ a second time, in the same way as the Virgin. Even her confessors believed in her and one of them was penanced in a private *auto*. She was condemned to two hundred lashes (which were subsequently spared her), to three years in the hospital of Jesus Nazarene of Córdova, and to seven subsequent years of exile from Córdova, Madrid, and her birth-place, Montoro.[2]

We again hear of Alumbrados in an *auto de fé* held in 1770 in the church of San Francisco de Murcia, where Miguel Cano, cura of Algezares, abjured *de vehementi*, Ana García, the *madre espiritual* of the sect, abjured *de formali*, together

there specifically quoted does not differ much from those condemned in the bull *Cœlestis Pastor*. It is "que Dios en la presente providencia permite á los Demonios que violenten á algunas almas santas á acciones externas intrinsicamente malas para purgarlas por este medio pasivamente el sentido."

[1] Records of the Spanish Inquisition translated from the Original MSS, Boston, 1828, p. 179.

I take this opportunity of thanking the unknown friend to whom I owe the possession of this scarce volume.

[2] Matute y Luquin, p. 292.

with two hermits and various women of the town of Mula. When we are told that they styled kisses *passos del alma* or steps of the soul, that they asserted themselves to be united in the essence of Jesus and transformed into the Holy Trinity, we recognize that the old leaven was still working and are reminded that the mystic rhapsodies of Santa Teresa and San Juan de la Cruz were still classics.[1] These were too firmly established to be eradicated, but new literature of the kind was not allowed. When the learned Canon Vicente Pastor de los Cobos, who was himself a *consultor* of the Inquisition and who died in the odor of sanctity, wrote his *Libro Grande de Mistica*, although it never was printed, a MS. copy was denounced to the Holy Office and was duly condemned.[2]

In spite of these efforts the impostors, so rife in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, continued to flourish on the boundless credulity of the people. At an *auto de fé* in Granada in 1778 there was punished a woman named Manuela Lopez, a ribbon weaver, aged 33, as guilty of the old fictions of revelations, visions and miracles; she had the wound of the lance on the side, she possessed prophetic power, she could withdraw souls from purgatory and read the interior of consciences. Yet her offences were visited with a leniency in marked contrast with the severity directed against Molinism. She appeared at the *auto* with a halter around the neck and the mitre of an impostor, and her sentence was merely a year in a house of correction and four years' exile from Granada, Illescas and all royal residences.

[1] Menendez y Pelayo, III. 94.

The sister kingdom of Portugal was troubled with similar manifestations. At the *auto de fé* of 1761, in which perished the unfortunate Malagrida, no less than eight women were condemned to various penances for imposture, feigning diabolical possession, trances, visions, etc.—Liste des personnes qui ont été condamnées á l' Acte publique de Foi, le 20 Septembre, 1761. Lisbonne, 1761, pp. 21–24.

[2] Lopez, El Sacro-Monte de Granada, Madrid, 1883, p. 139.

Her confessor, who was doubtless an accomplice, was penanced at a private *auto* to avoid scandal.[1]

More remarkable in every respect was the case of María de los Dolores Lopez, known as the Beata Dolores, who suffered as a Molinist, in 1781, at Seville. She was, or pretended to be, blind and ascribed her ability to read and write and embroider to miraculous interposition. At the age of twelve she left her father's house to live as a concubine with her confessor. Four years later he died, when she went to Marchena and assumed the habit of a beata which she continued to wear. Her quick intelligence gained for her a high reputation among the people, who imagined that only supernatural gifts could enable a blind person to divine things so readily. The fame of her sanctity and of the special graces enjoyed by her spread far and wide; she held long conversations with her guardian angel, after the fashion of Josepha de San Luis Beltran, but her career at Marchena was brought to an end by her corrupting her confessor. He was relegated to a convent of rigid observance and she went to Seville, where she followed the same hypocritical life for twelve years till, in July, 1779, one of her confessors, pricked by conscience, denounced both herself and himself to the Inquisition, and abundant evidence as to her scandals was easily obtained. The trial lasted for two years, for she resolutely maintained the truth of her pretensions; since the age of four she had been the object of special grace, she had continual and familiar intercourse with the Virgin, she had been married in heaven to the child Jesus with St. Joseph and St. Augustin as witnesses, she had liberated millions of souls from purgatory, and much more of the same sort. Had she been content to confess herself an impostor she would have escaped with the customary moderate punishment of reclusion, but she rendered herself guilty of formal and obstinate heresy by maintaining the so-called Molinist doctrine that evil ac-

[1] Menendez y Pelayo, III. 94.

tions cease to be sinful when God so wills it. Every effort was made to convert her. The most eminent theologians were summoned and vainly exhausted their learning and eloquence; Fray Diego de Cadiz preached to her constantly for two months. She was equally unmoved by the threat of burning; God, she said, had revealed to her that she would die a martyr, after which he would in three days prove her innocence. Burning was going out of fashion, and the Inquisition honestly endeavored to escape its necessity, but her obstinacy admitted of no alternative, and on August 22, 1781, she was finally condemned and abandoned to the secular arm. She listened unmoved to the sentence, after which, in place of being as usual hurried at once to the stake, she was, as a supreme effort, kept for three days in the chapel with holy men exhorting her to no purpose. Then at the *auto de fé* every one was melted to pity on seeing her with the mitre of flames and demons, while she alone remained impassible during the sermon and ceremony—in fact she had to be gagged to suppress her blasphemy. Finally however on her way to the stake she weakened, she burst into tears and asked for a confessor. The execution was postponed for some hours and her punishment was mitigated, according to rule, with preliminary strangulation.[1]

It mattered little that the Inquisition did good work in exposing these impostures. Popular superstition was ready to believe anything, and ingenuity was never at a loss in devising means to gratify it. Isabel María Herraiz, known as the Beata de Cuenca, was a woman of the lowest class, the wife of a laborer of Villar del Aguila. She obtained the reputation of sanctity and, in order to increase the devotion of her disciples, she announced that Christ had revealed to her that, with the object of being more perfectly united to

[1] This account of María de los Dolores is, for the most part, based upon Menendez y Pelayo (III. 405). In the Municipal Archives of Seville, however, there is a brief statement of the *auto* by an eyewitness, which differs from the above in some particulars. It will be found in the Appendix.

her in love, he had transfused his body and blood into hers. This novel proposition gave rise to a lively theological discussion. Some learned doctors maintained that it was impossible, as it would render her more holy than the Virgin and would deprive the sacrament of the exclusive distinction of being the body and blood of the Lord. Others argued that it was possible, but that in the existing case the proofs were insufficient. Others again accepted it as true and urged in defence the acknowledged virtues of the beata and the absence of motives for lying. Her disciples worshipped her, carrying her in procession through the streets with lighted tapers, and prostrating themselves before her in adoration. At last the Inquisition interposed and put an end to the blasphemous farce by imprisoning her and her accomplices. Possibly she may have been roughly handled in the examinations for she died in the *carceles secretas* without confession. In the *auto de fé* which followed she was burnt in effigy, while the cura of Villar and two confederate monks followed with halters around their necks and were banished for life to the Philippines. The cura of Casasimarro was suspended for six years; two laymen received two hundred lashes apiece, with banishment for life to the Presidios or African garrisons, and the beata's maid was consigned to a house of correction for ten years.[1]

By this time in Spain we hear little of so-called Molinism, but in the New World it continued to give occupation to the Holy Office. In 1790, in New Granada, a Capuchin whose name Llorente kindly suppresses, and who had been provincial and guardian, seduced thirteen beguines in a house under his spiritual direction by telling them that Christ had appeared to him and commanded him to have commerce with them in order to lead them to perfect union with the Divine Essence. To prevent scandal he was sent with the evidences of his crime to Spain for trial. Before the Inquisition of

[1] Llorente, IV. 123.

Madrid he obstinately maintained the truth of the vision until the Inquisitor, kindly violating the established rule of procedure, hinted to him that if he persisted there would be no alternative but to burn him as an unrepentant heretic. Then he confessed and was sentenced to a circular scourging by the friars of the Capuchin convent of Madrid, to be followed by five years' confinement in a college of his Order in Valencia. He begged to be kept in the inquisitorial prison, saying that he knew what his fate would be among his fellows, but his prayer was refused and his prescience was verified, for he died before three years of his penance were completed.[1]

While this case was in progress the Mexican Inquisition was busy with one, reminding us in some of its features of those of Francisco Ortiz and Joseph Bruñon de Vertiz. It is worth considering in some detail as illustrating inquisitorial methods and the intricacy of the questions raised by the Molinist controversy. Fray Eusebio de Villaroja was a Franciscan of the strictest observance, learned, eloquent, austere in life, and of irreproachable conduct. In Spain he had twice endeavored to undertake a mission to the Philippines but had been told that his services as a preacher could not be spared, but the Guardian of the Franciscan mission college at Pachuca in Mexico finally made interest to obtain his assignment there, and in 1783 he reached the New World, at the age of thirty-eight. He was promptly appointed lector in morals and *resolutor de casos;* his brethren regarded him as an oracle, and his kindly earnestness made him a universal favorite. He was strongly inclined to mysticism, and wrote a little work entitled *Oracion de Fé interior,* which the Inquisition subsequently pronounced to contain no reprobated doctrines, but to be dangerous because it dismissed as useless all reading and meditation and inducted the neophyte at once into the mysteries of mental prayer.

Two or three years after reaching Pachuca Fray Eusebio

[1] Llorente, III. 44.

undertook the spiritual direction of two girls, Gertrudis and Josepha Palacios, who represented themselves as subject to demoniacal possession and were adepts in all the mystic arts —ecstasies, visions, revelations and prophecies. In less than a year Gertrudis died and Josepha so completely engrossed the attention of Fray Eusebio that he gave himself up almost entirely to her. She took communion daily at his hand, she spent morning and afternoon at his confessional, and at night he would frequently be sent for to exorcise her. She was then about twenty years of age, and on her trial she confessed that since the age of twelve she had been abandoned to the most degrading form of sensuality against which she said she vainly struggled. Something of this she confided to Fray Eusebio in the confessional, attributing it to the violence of the demons who possessed her, and his theory that this was allowed by God to cure her of the sin of pride formed the principal charge against him, as the inquisitors argued that this was rank Molinism.

Fray Eusebio became so completely subjugated by these girls that his credulity was boundless. He even announced a prophecy that on a given day they would rise from the floor of the church, soar through the windows and ascend to glory, and when the allotted time passed he explained that the prophecy had been conditional and that the conditions had not occurred. He reduced to writing all their visions and revelations with untiring industry until he had filled seventy-six books in his remarkably condensed chirography. He made no secret of all this and his guileless simplicity was shared by a number of his brethren. In fact, as a disbeliever said, when any one remonstrated with him he defended his position with so much eloquence and learning that any one not cognizant of the facts would have been convinced.

One of the revelations obtained through Josepha was that God sent demons to instruct the faithful in piety and virtue and Christian observances; thus they frequented churches in human form, presented themselves at the confessional and

took the Eucharist, which they could not swallow but which nevertheless disappeared. This notion led to an aggressive demonstration about June, 1788, when on several occasions Eusebio suddenly sprang from his confessional and assailed harmless penitents awaiting their turn, stigmatizing them as demons, beating them with his cord and pulling them by the hair or ears. He also chased dogs out of the church, crying out that they were devils. This created no little talk and scandal, which were aggravated by a fainting-fit of Josepha after receiving communion. The convent physician, who had treated him for dyspepsia, thought that undue austerity and too ardent study had engendered hypochondriac humors and the Guardian felt that it was time to interfere. He ordered Eusebio to attend to his other duties, to give Josepha not more than an hour in the confessional and never to go to her house. Eusebio promptly obeyed; he ceased to talk of her visions and prophecies and she naturally ceased to have them. This affair quieted down, and when, more than a year afterwards, Fray Juan Sanchez, as official inspector of the province, questioned him, he admitted that he had erred; that as the Guardian had been cognizant of it throughout he had supposed it to be right, but as soon as the Guardian reproved him, by the grace of God he recognized his error; he now understood the matter and would not relapse into belief and he had so told Josepha. A man of such Christian humility and so true to his vows of obedience was easily managed: it required inquisitorial ingenuity to make a heretic and a martyr of him, and if the Inquisition had withheld its hand the affair would have been no more thought of.

Unluckily the Guardian, apparently not knowing whether Eusebio would prove tractable and dreading his influence with the brethren, had at the same time taken the further precaution of sending two friars to Mexico to denounce him to the Inquisition. Their testimony was duly taken down, and the fiscal or prosecuting officer was entrusted with the case. In November the Guardian was in Mexico and was

summoned as a witness, when he told the whole story, adding that Eusebio's eccentricities had ceased on being reprehended, and he evidently considered the incident as closed. Not so the Inquisition, which in its deliberate fashion continued to accumulate a formidable mass of testimony, all bearing witness however to the culprit's eminent piety and virtue and the blamelessness of his life. So on the inspector's visit to Pachuca in July, 1789, he was ordered to inquire into the matter and to secure the diaries kept by Eusebio; they were at once cheerfully surrendered and his report of August 7 in transmitting them was wholly favorable to the accused. In fact, the last entry in the diary, under date of August 5, was one in which Eusebio humbly submitted to the judgment of the Church not only himself but the authenticity of all the wonders which he had narrated.

In spite of all this the Inquisition continued its preparations and in July, 1790, it sent for Eusebio to present himself. The somewhat unusual favor of an *audiencia de cargos* was granted him before arrest, unfortunately for him, as it proved, for he did not understand that he was virtually on trial. The audience lasted from the 3d to the 18th of August and turned principally on the question whether God, for the greater perfection of the creature, will permit the demon to lead her into foul and obscene actions; the position taken by Eusebio being that God, for hidden reasons, may do so and that consequently penance may not be necessary—a conclusion which he said he had derived from cases cited by Liguori. Over this there was a prolonged and subtle disputation. It was not, as we have seen, the practice of the Inquisition to formulate definite charges or to reveal the evidence in its possession until immediately before the close of a trial, meanwhile allowing the accused to flounder in helpless ignorance and to entangle himself in the snares cunningly spread before him. Eusebio repeatedly declared afterwards that if he had known that this audience was anything more than an effort to ascertain his opinions he would at once have sub-

mitted himself to the correction of the Inquisition, have abjured and detested any errors which it might condemn, and have asked for appropriate penance. No intimation of the kind, however, was given; he was allowed to involve himself inextricably in the subtleties of theological disputation; the controversial pride of the inquisitor, Prado y Obejero, was fairly aroused, and Eusebio's efforts to distinguish between his doctrine and that of Molinos, which he heartily abhorred, were pronounced futile.

It is not worth while to follow in detail the steps of the prolonged trial. After three years of preliminary work the Inquisition was ready to proceed; on October 13, 1791, Eusebio was thrown into the secret prison and the case went through its regular stages. Wholly superfluous were the customary threats that torture would be resorted to and that obstinacy would bring him to the stake, for never was there a less defiant culprit. On every fitting occasion he protested that he had been miserably led into error by ignorance and had sustained as Catholic a doctrine deserving condemnation. The lights now given to him respecting violence exercised by demons had caused him to reflect; though his opinions had been based on Arbíol and Liguori he did not wish to be obstinate and he was ready to reform his belief wherever he had wandered from Christian doctrine. He begged to be undeceived as to anything in which he might have erred; he wished promptly to retract whatever was inconsistent with Catholic dogma and to submit himself to the correction of the Holy Office, for he earnestly sought the discharge of his conscience and the salvation of his soul. Nothing, in fact, could exceed the humility of his gentle spirit, but nothing could appease the implacability of his judges. Yet when, in the trial of Josepha, the fiscal drew up her accusation, he heightened her crime by describing her as a liar capable of forging another Alcoran; as the cause and origin of the sufferings of Eusebio, both the corporal ones which he bears with such resignation and the spiritual ones which harrow

him with the clear knowledge which he has acquired of her sacrilegious impositions on his credulity.

Although the situation was thus clearly understood by the tribunal it brought him no alleviation. On April 26, 1793, he appeared as a penitent in an *auto particular* in the hall of the Inquisition where only the ecclesiastics of the city were present. His sentence was read, in which was embodied as proved the enormously long accusation reciting all his follies and describing him as hardened and obstinate in his errors as an alumbrado and Molinist. Though he had deserved great and heavy penalties, the sentence went on to say, he would be treated with mercy. He was to be sharply and severely reproved, to abjure *de vehementi*, to be forever deprived of the function of confessing, and to be banished to the distance of twenty leagues from the city of Mexico, Pachuca and Madrid for ten years, of which the first three were to be passed in reclusion in the Franciscan college of San Fernando in the city, where he was to be subjected to certain humiliations, penances and austerities, and finally he was to be sent to Spain whenever the inquisitors might see fit.

The fate of a friar condemned by the Inquisition to reclusion among his brethren was usually unendurable, and it is a singular testimony to the purity and sweetness of Eusebio's character, that, like Francisco Ortiz, he won the veneration of those among whom he was thus thrown, to whom, as they declared, his daily life was an edification. Even those of the college of Pachuca, whose poverty was increased by being forced to pay the expenses of his trial and of his subsequent deportation, seem to have regarded him with unabated affection. He duly performed his penances, but his severest affliction was an indirect result of his prosecution. In youth he had suffered from rheumatism; during his eighteen months of incarceration the dampness of his cell had brought this back with redoubled force and he was crippled. After a year's reclusion, in May, 1794, he addressed an humble peti-

tion to the Inquisition thanking it for the benefits conferred, stating his condition, scarce able to walk and with a chronic rheum of the eyes, and begging to be remanded to the dryer atmosphere of Pachuca as the moist climate of the city was destroying him. After a perfunctory visit from the official physician this was refused, but he was offered the alternative of a transfer to Tacubaya which he declined. Another year passed away without alleviation and in March, 1795, he addressed an appeal to the Archbishop of Toledo, the inquisitor general. The document is a curious one, written in the closest handwriting with great economy of paper, evidently to enable it to be smuggled to Spain, for the proceeding was most irregular. In it he states as the cause of his condemnation that he had maintained that God might permit the temptation of the flesh to cure the pride of the soul, by which he understood that of the vice and not of the guilt or fault, while the Inquisitor Prado y Obejero insisted that the cure of pride without virtue was false doctrine. The question, he added, had been publicly discussed at Toledo sixteen years before, when he was teacher in the Franci can convent there, when neither the archbishop nor the Inquisition had objected to the doctrine, and he proceeded to set forth the argument in its favor at much length and with great learning. He declared his readiness to perish in the flames for the faith as he held it. His sufferings, he added, were on the increase and with prophetic spirit he said that if kept in the city of Mexico or sent to Spain he would surely die.

Another year passed away, and in March, 1796, the Guardian of San Fernando appealed to the Inquisition to save him, describing him as continually growing worse and liable to be permanently disabled if he had not speedy relief. Eusebio was becoming desperate; in the unstable fancies of the sick man any change must be for the better, and when his three years of reclusion were past, about May 1, 1796, he begged to be sent to Spain. Meanwhile his appeal to the inquisitor general had been forwarded by the Supreme Coun-

cil to Mexico with orders for the transmission of the papers; copies of these had been dispatched, and the result was a command to transmit him to Spain as provided in the sentence. This reached Mexico in June, 1796, and instructions were immediately issued to the college of Pachuca to make provision for his conveyance. When the news was brought to Eusebio he protested that his condition was such that it would kill him, but without avail. The Guardian of Pachuca kindly arranged to postpone the voyage until after October and meanwhile to carry him to Tacubaya in hopes that he might improve during the interval. Towards the close of October he was conveyed by easy stages to Vera Cruz, and one of the documents in the records is a bill of lading by which the master of the good ship Aurora acknowledges the receipt, November 8, 1796, of one convict named Fray Eusebio de Villarejo, shipped by the Inquisition of Mexico, to be delivered to the commissioner of the Inquisition at Cadiz. The Aurora sailed November 9; she touched at Havana and news was brought thence that on the ninth day out Eusebio had rendered his gentle spirit to his Creator—not the only innocent victim of the insane fury excited by the errors attributed to Molinos. Of the fate of Josepha we know nothing.[1]

Contemporary with this was a case which to some extent explains the prevalent suspicion felt towards the ardor of mysticism in the dangerous relations of the confessional, when the recital of past sins by female lips was rendered suggestively infectious by the passion which might lurk under the aspirations of divine love. Pedro Fernandez Ybarraran was a Spanish priest who had studied for thirteen years at Alcalá and subsequently at Toledo. He had led a somewhat roving life, he had drifted to the Pacific coast around Cape Horn and after many wanderings, in 1784, at the age of 36, had settled at Puebla, where he won a high character for the fervor and

[1] Proceso de Fray Eusebio de Villaroja (MSS. of David Fergusson, Esq.

zeal with which he discharged his duties. He was, however, inconsiderate and impulsive and, under an exterior of piety, as he confessed during his trial, he had from youth upwards been guilty of innumerable sins with women. The other actor in the drama was a woman 34 years old, named María Bárbara Echagaray, who had led an unsettled existence apart from her family. She seems to have been a person of considerable attractions, with quick intelligence and lively imagination, but subject to epileptic attacks. Although Mexico boasted that, through the influence of its patroness, Our Lady of Guadalupe, it was singularly free from demoniacal possession, all nervous affections of this nature were attributed to that cause and she had been frequently exorcised. According to her own story, in August, 1792, she was aroused to a sense of her depravity by an internal voice saying to her "how long?" and she sought a confessor. Evil fate led her to Ybarraran, and after some preliminary partial confessions she commenced a general confession, September 24, which lasted until October 9. For twenty years she had led a most abandoned life, the details of which as faithfully set down by her confessor, transcend belief in their vileness. She had procured numerous abortions on herself, she had twice signed pacts with the devil written in her blood, she had had more than one incubus, and she had committed with the host and the image of Christ the sacrileges usually ascribed to Jews.[1] A creature more wholly lost to grace and destined to perdition it would be impossible to conceive.

Yet Barbara's fervor of conversion and yearning for reunion with God were so ardent that Ybarraran speedily came to believe that God had selected her as a shining example of divine mercy and that she was destined, as he said, to be the St. Magdalen of Mexico. He might also have instanced the

[1] It illustrates the condition of intelligence at the close of the eighteenth century that in a discussion between Ybarraran and the inquisitor concerning the various incubi of Barbara neither of them entertain the slightest doubt as to the existence of such relations between demons and human beings.

Blessed Angela of Foligno as a similar case. He applied to the Inquisition for a licence to absolve her, and then, without awaiting it, when she seemed to be dying of a hemorrhage to which she was subject, he absolved her conditionally and subsequently admitted her to communion. From childhood she had been given to visions; these now came frequently and were mostly allegorical, displaying considerable powers of invention. One of them, about a strayed sheep, so affected Ybarraran that it converted him; he repented of his past sins, he thenceforth led a virtuous life and he redoubled his ardor in his religious duties. His attention was directed to mysticism; he procured some mystic books and studied them diligently, acquiring sufficient knowledge to lead him fatally astray. In place of advancing the beata in due course through the *via purgativa activa*, the *via purgativa pasiva* and the *via iluminativa* to the *via unitiva*, he allowed her to ascend at once from the depths of sin to union with God and a state of perfection in which her virginity was restored.

So thoroughly was he convinced of her saintliness that he committed the ruinous indiscretion of keeping a minute diary of his intercourse with her. It is this which, amid all his indiscretions and the glaring impostures of his beata, convinces me of his sincerity. Had he been merely a licentious priest engaged in an amour with an abandoned woman he would no more have kept a record of it than of his innumerable similar adventures in the past, but in this curious document every detail, even of seemingly the most compromising character, was set forth minutely and accompanied with a mystical commentary which could not fail to convict him of heresy and "solicitation" in case it should see the light. Yet he read it, or portions of it, to learned theologians whom he consulted, and who warned him of the dangers which he was incurring; and a passage in it shows that he honestly believed himself to be earning the gratitude of all future spiritual directors by leaving to them an imperish-

able guide of the greatest value in the conduct of mystical souls.[1]

The demoniacal possession of his beata continued and alternated in the most abrupt manner with revelations and visions of heaven and hell. In these states she apparently was insensible and spoke mechanically as though God or the demon was using her tongue as an instrument. Sometimes her utterances were of the most vulgar obscenity; she declared herself burning with lust and entreated Ybarraran to gratify her, and his description of these passages and of his expedients to preserve her virtue and his own is of inconceivable plainness, impossible of transcription. Then on her awakening from the trance they would hug and kiss each other, as he declared, for the greater glory of God and in mockery of the baffled demons who had vainly sought to seduce them from the path of virtue. He frequently passed the night in her house and finally took up his residence there, which does not seem to have been regarded as unusual or as interfering with his usefulness as director of the Christian schools. Yet he mingled austerity with affection and often administered the discipline to her while chanting the *Miserere*, on one occasion giving her 234 blows, which he is careful to explain were not on the bare skin. Barbara meanwhile was endeavoring to earn an honest support as a sempstress, but the boldness of her imposture is seen in the incident that, after a course of mortifications and severe spiritual and bodily suffering, she succeeded in winning back at least one of her blood-written compacts with the fiend, which mysteriously appeared upon her bed during a trance and was solemnly burnt by Ybarraran, who scattered the ashes with his breath.

He made the fatal plunge into Molinism by maintaining that she was not responsible for her fits of lustful longing, for

1 "El que tubiere la dicha de poner este en limpio despues de mi muerte dará gracias á Dios, extendera esta doctrina en castellano y me hecherá un *requiescat in pace*."

that these were the work of demons commissioned by God to purify her soul in the *via purgativa pasiva*; but he sought to establish the distinction that the condemned doctrine of Molinos related to sins committed by the soul in possession of its faculties, while the case of his beata was an unexampled one, in which the sinning soul was unconscious and was merely the passive instrument of the divine operation through diabolical agents empowered to control both body and soul. Another serious error was that he disregarded the received rules of spiritual directorship, considering the case to be an exceptional one, and he followed, as he said, the dictates of his own heart in the conduct of his penitent, believing that they were both under the immediate inspiration of God.

This could not go on without attracting attention and leading to the interposition of the Inquisition, which commenced, in its usual mode, to make secret investigations concerning him. It soon heard of his diary and in November, 1794, orders were sent to seize it. Ybarraran surrendered it without resistance but forthwith had the imprudence to address a letter to Pius VI. complaining of the act as a violation of the seal of the confessional; he had been taken, he said, by surprise; had he had time for reflection he would have braved prison and death rather than give it up; he asked papal instructions as to what he should do and that the Inquisition be ordered to treat him mildly. This missive naturally received no attention, and the Inquisition proceeded with its customary deliberation. It was not till December 23, 1795, that the fiscal made his official demand for the arrest and prosecution of Ybarraran and his beata. The order was issued January 21, 1796, and on the night of February 15 he was consigned to the secret prison in Mexico.

His case at first was pushed with unusual despatch, and already by April 19 commenced the formal *Audiencia de Acusacion*, which occupied thirty-one days and was not concluded until August was well advanced. The accusation was a most formidable affair, consisting of 146 articles on all of

which he was exhausively examined. He had manifested no obstinate longing for martyrdom, and from the first had declared that he had been deceived by his beata, that he was ready to retract any errors into which he might have fallen and to accept whatever penance might be imposed on him, for his only desire was to save his soul by living and dying in the orthodox Catholic faith. In this frame of mind his case could have been summarily disposed of, but the inquisitors as usual were determined to follow the routine and to prove him guilty. He was forced into endless disputations on the most subtle points of mystic theology, in which the practised skill of his judges, with all his writings and answers before them, easily involved him in the most complicated mazes of heresy. In the several *calificaciones* which took place in the course of the trial he is pronounced guilty of the errors of the Millenarians, Beghards, Gnostics, Alumbrados, Molinists, Lutherans, Quesnellists, Waldenses, Pelagians, Fraticelli and even of the Quakers.

He had not toughness of body or mind to resist this tremendous strain, in the solitude of his cell and under the pressure of awful suspense. Before he had been a month in prison he complained that the deprivation of exercise had caused a trembling of the legs and the recurrence of an old disease which threatened him with suffocation. No attention was paid to his sufferings, and in September soon after the conclusion of his *Audiencia de Acusacion* he could endure the situation no longer. He asked for an audience in which he formally renounced all defence. His health, he said, was destroyed, he was infested with visions and temptations to despair, leading him to expect madness or sudden death. All that he wanted was that his case should be concluded, and he would willingly submit to whatever the Inquisition might prescribe. He protested that he had acted in good faith with his beata, but he submitted in all things his belief to the Holy Office.

The imperturbable and implacable tribunal was too much

accustomed to such ejaculations of despair to pay heed to them. The trial dragged along in the customary deliberate routine. It was not until the spring of 1797 that the "publication of proof" took place, in which all the evidence was read over to him, including his own writings, and he was allowed or required to explain or argue against it. This occupied sixteen days and must have exhausted his failing powers. In July he had an interview with the advocate allotted to him, who took six months to draw up a simulacrum of defence, presented January 12, 1798. On July 4 the case was finally submitted to the *calificadores*, who, in view of the voluminousness of the records, were unable to render their decision until November, when they reported that in view of his Catholic protests they pronounced him only subjectively suspect *de vehementi* of Molinism. Here the record before me ends, with no indication that a sentence was rendered. From its form as a *relacion* it must evidently have been drawn up for submission to the Supreme Council in Spain, which indicates that there must have been a *discordia* between the inquisitors—a difference of opinion as to the punishment to be inflicted. In view of the habitual delays under such circumstances it is tolerably safe to assume that Ybarraran was either dead or hopelessly mad before the termination of his trial. I have no means of knowing what became of Bárbara Echegaray.[1]

An *auto de fé* at Madrid, celebrated by the Inquisition in 1802, was graced by a penitent who had imposed upon the highest social class and even upon the Holy See itself. The Beata Clara of Madrid had acquired great reputation by her visions and revelations and miracles. She pretended to be paralyzed and unable to leave her bed, and when she announced that by the special command of the Holy Ghost she was destined to become a Capuchin but was unable to

[1] Relacion de la Causa de don Pedro Fernandez Ybarraran (MSS. of David Fergusson, Esq.).

live in a convent, Pius VI. gave her a dispensation authorizing her to take the vows outside of the community and without residence. Atanasio de Puyal, coadjutor of the Archbishop of Toledo, and subsequently Bishop of Calahorra, administered the vows and obtained permission to erect a private altar in her room at which mass was celebrated and she received the sacrament daily, pretending to take no other food. All the great ladies of the court flocked around her and implored her intercession in every kind of trouble, giving her large sums to be expended in charity. The comedy lasted for several years until in 1801 the Inquisition laid hands on her, and she was thrown into prison, with her mother and spiritual director as confederates. The imposture was proved and all three were sentenced to incarceration.[1] In spite of this example a somewhat similar case occurred the next year. A girl aged 22, named María Bermeja entered the hospital of Madrid. Her disease was epilepsy, which rendered her a favorable instrument for superstitious imposture, and the sub-director, Joseph Cebrian, with the aid of the chaplain, Iñigo Acero, made a saint of her with a number of ingenious devices to excite popular veneration, until the Inquisition interposed and punished them all.[2]

Human nature changes slowly and the nineteenth century still offers an ample field for exploitation by enthusiasts and impostors—enthusiasts who seek a higher life in mystical aspirations towards the Creator, and knaves of either sex who speculate upon the credulity of the people. The last prisoners of the Inquisition of Córdoba were two *beatas*, whose trial was still pending when the Holy Office was finally suppressed in 1820, and they were set free.[3] The absence of the Inquisition seems to have produced little change except relegating these cases to different tribunals. In 1836 a sect

[1] Llorente, IV. 125.
[2] Llorente, IV. 127.
[3] Matute y Luquin, p. 296.

accused of entertaining the doctrine of Molinos and the alumbrados was formed in the province of Tarragona by a laborer named Miguel Ribas and a cleric, Don José Suaso—the latter a man of education as he had been professor of Latin in the diocesan seminary. For a number of years they seem to have propagated their errors without opposition, but at length, although the Inquisition had long been extinct, machinery was set in motion for the vindication of the faith. The governor of the province denounced them and in 1851 they were duly tried by the episcopal court—the original tribunal for heretical offences. From the condemnation pronounced on the propositions uttered by Miguel Ribas and the beatas of Alforja it would seem that their errors were virtually the same as those we have followed since the sixteenth century, for their doctrine was declared to be erroneous, audacious, scandalous, blasphemous, dangerous to the faith, heretical, insulting to the dignity of the sacraments, contrary to the sixth commandment, destructive of purity and of morality and of the sanctity of marriage, and openly adverse to the Catholic dogma of the necessity of the sacrament of penitence. Ribas was banished to Urgel, whence he returned in 1863 to die at his home at Alforja, reconciled to the Church. Shortly afterwards in Valencia a priest named Aparisi commenced to disseminate similar errors, but his career was cut short by banishment to Majorca.[1]

Another sect connected with our subject by its being founded on visions and revelations assumed the specious title of *la Obra de Misericordia*. This took its origin in France, with a man named Elias, claiming to be a prophet and to hold frequent communication with the Archangel Michael. Subsequent to the Restoration the sect made itself busy in politics by supporting the claims of one of the fictitious Louis XVII., and Elias had the audacity to present himself to Charles X. and to demand the surrender of the crown to the

[1] Menendez y Pelayo, III. 688–9.

rightful heir. Some legitimists associated themselves with him, and the sect founded in Lyons a sort of lay church of which Elias was high pontiff, officiating in a priestly cope with a gold ring on his right forefinger and reading the service from the Golden Book of the community. They administered communion in both elements, the priestly functions were performed by laymen, and at the close of the service men and women exchanged the fraternal kiss. The sect had proselytes in Madrid, where its conventicles were held in a house in the *Calle del Soldado*. Señor Menendez y Pelayo possesses a letter written by Elias to one of the Spanish devotees known as María de Pura Llama, an apocalyptic composition in which the writer converses directly with the angels and with God.[1]

The notorious case of Sor Patrocinio affords a more significant instance of the strength of old superstitions. María Rafaela Quiroga, known in religion as Sor María Cipriana del Patrocinio de San José, was born about 1810. When thirteen or fourteen years of age, after the death of her father and brother, her mother placed her in a convent. In January, 1829, she took the veil in the house of San José, commonly known as *del Caballero de Gracia* in Madrid, where she soon commenced to have ecstasies and revelations, followed by the appearance of the stigmata. The fame of her sanctity spread, noble ladies went to see her, and the cloths stained with blood from her wounds were in request as curative relics. In the fierce struggle caused by the rebellion of Don Carlos, the clericals who secretly favored the pretender saw in Sor Patrocinio a useful instrument. Rumors were spread by friars of her prophecies of victories for Don Carlos and of the final overthrow of Isabel, and a story was circulated that on one occasion the demon had carried her through the air to Aranjuez where she witnessed convincing proof of the

[1] Menendez y Pelayo, III. 689.

immorality of the Queen-regent María Cristina and of the illegitimacy of her daughter Isabel. This was a matter of high public import; in the doubtful condition of affairs the visions of the nun were becoming dangerous and the government felt it necessary to interfere.

Process was publicly commenced, testimony was taken, and early in November, 1835, a judge was sent to the convent to interrogate the Sor and the other members of the community. They unanimously denied responsibility for the political rumors, but, with the exception of one young sister, they all, including the Sor herself, attested the reality of the ecstasies and stigmata—on one occasion the wounds in the hands bled so freely that the blood filled two coffee cups. As for the adventure with the demon, it was testified that about half-past ten one morning she had disappeared and between twelve and one was found lying insensible on the roof of one of the convent buildings, with her dress covered with dust and fragments of vegetation, as though she had been dragged through the fields. It appeared however that the roof was nearly flat, with a large window opening upon it from a room in the second story of the main building. The case turned on the question whether the stigmata were supernatural or artificial, and the judge ordered her removed to a place where she could be examined and guarded, but the prioress and sisters offered so violent a resistance that for the avoidance of scandal he yielded. Then the government intervened and caused her to be taken to a private house where she was kept under the charge of her mother and of an intelligent priest. Three physicians, Diego Argumosa, Mateo Seaone and Maximiano Gonzalez examined the wounds, and their minutely scientific report, November 9, 1835, is a curiosity of medical jurisprudence. On the backs of the hands were ulcers, produced by a mild caustic, and on the palms were scratches; there was no sign of bleeding, but they were covered with a dark red substance, insoluble in water, which was removed with difficulty. On the left side was a nearly healed sore, apparently pro-

duced by friction; the cloth which covered this was stained with the same red substance, although the Sor declared it had been clean when put on the night before. On the top of the feet were cicatrices nearly well, while the soles bore no mark of any kind. Around the forehead were three series of spots, each about fifteen in number, produced by a cutting instrument; the first were old scars, whitish and thoroughly healed, the second were of about the same date as the cicatrices on the feet, and the third were six or eight days old. If interference could be prevented the physicians promised that all could be cured in from fifteen to fifty days. Nature was allowed to have her way; every other day a bulletin reported progressive healing of the stigmata, except on November 27, when the right hand ulcer was found bleeding in consequence of the scab having been torn off, and on December 17 she was reported as entirely well. On January 21, 1836, an inspection was made by a number of dignitaries, lay and clerical; the physicians' reports were read to Sor Patrocinio, who confirmed their correctness and declared herself satisfactorily cured. After this she was removed to the convent of Santa María Magdalena, commonly known as the *Recojidas*, where, on February 7, she made a confession under oath, after due warning of the penalties of perjury.

She had been brought up, she said, under the discipline of blind obedience to her superiors, leading her to become their victim, and depriving her of liberty in thought, word and act. A Capuchin, Padre Fermin de Alcaráz—subsequently described by her advocate in her defence as *fanático é ignorante en sumo grado*—who was called in to see a sick nun, had given her what he called a relic and commanded her on her salvation to apply it to hands, feet, side and head, telling her that the sufferings it would cause would be salutary penance; she had done so, and in further obedience had never revealed it to any one, even to her confessor. As to her being found on the roof, she had no knowledge how she got there; when she recovered her senses two of the sisters were leading her to

the refectory. Padre Fermin de Alcaráz was vainly searched for; he had disappeared and was supposed to have fled the kingdom. His trial was duly commenced and he apparently was condemned *in contumaciam.*

The case of Sor Patrocinio and of the Vicar, Prioress and Vicaress of the convent as accessories, took the usual course. It was argued by the prosecuting officer and by counsel for the accused. The advocate of the Sor took the ground that she was a victim and the innocent instrument of those who devised the frauds; as to the adventure with the demon, the evidence pointed to her having been drugged and carried out on the roof. There was no undue haste, and sentence was not rendered until November 25, 1836. Then an appeal was taken, with little benefit to the accused, for the final sentence was somewhat more severe than the first one. The convent was suppressed; the vicar, Andrés Rivas, was banished for eight years from within twenty leagues of Madrid and all royal residences. Sor Patrocinio, the Prioress and the Vicaress were ordered to be transferred to convents of rigorous observance of their own Order, not less than fifteen leagues from Madrid, and to live under surveillance to be provided by the Archbishop of Toledo. It was not till April 27, 1837, that this was executed. To avoid public excitement, at five o'clock A. M. a chaplain took Sor Patrocinio from the Recojidas in a carriage; she wore a secular dress and travelled under her own name of María Rafaela Quiroga, and at eight P. M. on the next day she was duly received in the convent of Madre de Dios at Talavera.[1]

After exposure so complete it would seem impossible for fanaticism to revive the delusion or to rehabilitate the sanctity of the impostor, but there are some superstitions so absolute as to be impervious to reason. Years passed away and Sor Patrocinio seemed to be forgotten in her retreat. Yet in the desperate struggle between Church and State,

[1] Estracto de la Causa seguida á Sor Patrocinio, Madrid, 1865.

between conservatism and innovation, the vicissitudes of the conflict recalled her to memory and it was felt that she could again be useful. In 1845 the convent of Jesus was built for her in Madrid; she returned with her stigmata freshened and her reputation as a saint strengthened. Imposing ceremonies were performed to render her entrance as impressive as possible, and she was conveyed to her convent under a canopy, like a royal personage. She held secret relations with persons of the highest rank until, in 1849, under the dictatorship of General Narváez, her influence became obnoxious to him. On the morning of October 31, when about to celebrate the feast of the eleven thousand virgins, she was seized by his order, placed in a postchaise, and hurried off to a convent in Badajoz. Important political documents were found among her papers, and when the decree of banishment was published it was accompanied with a reprint of the account of her former trial, which had appeared in 1837. Yet like Antæus she gathered new strength from her falls. It was not long before she returned from Badajoz to occupy a new and vast convent prepared for her by the royal consort, Don Francisco de Asis, who also gave her brother an honorable office with apartments in the royal palace. Dr. Argumosa, who had cured her stigmata, was persecuted, while Fray Fermin Alcaráz, who had emerged from his hiding-place, became Bishop of Cuenca. She long remained the power behind the throne, acting through the *camarilla* which governed the queen, and herself the tool of the papal nuncios.[1]

[1] Usóz y Rio, Notas á los dos Tratados de Cipriano de Valera (Reformistas antiguos Españoles, Madrid, 1851).

Sor Patrocinio has been by no means the only ecstatic of the nineteenth century to whom the distinguishing grace of the stigmata has been vouchsafed. She was preceded by Katherine Emmerich, the nun of Dülmen, and contemporary with her were three girls of the Tyrol, Maria von Mörl, Domenica Lazzari and Crescenzia Nicklutsch, all of whom had the customary series of visions and raptures and trances (Die Tyroler ekstatischen Jungfrauen, Regensburg, 1843.—Ennemoser's History of Magic, Howitt's Translation, Vol. I. p. 100.—Howitt's History of the Supernatural, Vol. I. p. 480.—

A still more recent example of the morbid excitability which we have been considering is recorded in the journals of 1887. At Torrox, a seaport near Malaga, a woman announced that the Virgin had appeared to her in a vision and commanded her to preach a new evangel requiring the abandonment of all property and a return to a primitive state of existence. The belief spread until it embraced a considerable number of the inhabitants. Clothing was discarded by both sexes; a large fire was built around which they danced while throwing into it their worldly effects. It is said that their children would have followed and the torch would have been applied to their houses had not the *guarda civil* been summoned by some of their saner neighbors. They were arraigned before court and their mental condition was shown when they were subjected to the experiment of hypnotization and proved to be facile subjects.

Impostors may be found everywhere and may everywhere attract the ignorant and the credulous. Superstition is confined to no Church and to no race. It ill becomes a generation which has furnished believers in Madame Blavatsky's Mahatmas, which sees in its midst the so-called Christian Scientists, and which has watched the growth of faith in the Book of Mormon, to cast a stone at those which, during the four centuries here reviewed, have reverenced the Beatas as gifted with a portion of the power of God. Still, the impartial student of human development can scarce fail to recognize as one of the causes of Spanish decadence the blind faith which led Philip IV. to regulate his cabinet by revela-

Nicholas, L'extatique et les Stigmatisées du Tyrol, Paris, 1844.—Boré, Les Stigmatisées du Tyrol, 2. Ed. Paris, 1846).—The more recent instance of Louise Lateau has given rise to quite a literature of controversy. The orthodox account may be found in Rohling's "Louise Lateau, her Stigmas and Ecstasy," New York, 1884. In the early part of the last century the celebrated case of La Cadière, who barely escaped being burnt alive, is fully described by Michelet, *La Sorcière*, ch. X.–XII.

tions reported through crafty monks and which suggested to Isabel II. the use of a fraudulent nun like Sor Patrocinio as a political agency. In the fierce competition of modern civilization no nation can afford to waste its energies. It was the misfortune of Spain that, at the critical moment when the new Europe was developing out of the old, when militarism commenced to give place to industrialism, her rulers sought to bind her irrevocably to the past and to close the gates which opened on the promise of the future. Thenceforth her energies, in place of expanding to meet the new exigencies of the new era, concentrated themselves more than ever on the dreams of mystic contemplation, and blind belief in supernatural forces sapped the self-reliant manhood which had made the name of Spaniard a terror to both hemispheres.

It is true that the Inquisition was untiring in its efforts to detect and punish imposture and to limit mysticism within the bounds of obedience, but at the same time it encouraged the spirit of which these were only erratic manifestations. National development is slow, and the temperament which has been formed and hardened through many generations cannot be changed in one or two. The turning-point has been reached, however, and all lovers of humanity will watch with interest the process of emancipation which in due time will aid in restoring a noble and vigorous race to its due position in the great assembly of modern nations.

ENDEMONIADAS.

In the preceding essay we have seen how frequently demoniacal possession was associated with the extravagances of mysticism, and how readily it was assumed as an adjunct to imposture. A brief account of one or two cases, uncomplicated with visions and ecstasies, may therefore not be out of place in supplementing our survey of these erratic manifestations of nervous exaltation, although the subject of possession is far too large a one to be treated here with any approach to completeness.

It was a grave misfortune for humanity that so many varieties of cerebral disturbance were attributed to demonic influence, but this was a belief handed down from the origin of Christianity, and to doubt its truth was heresy. The casting out of devils was a function eagerly claimed and largely performed by the early Christians, who regarded their control over evil spirits as one of the most efficient proofs of the truth of their religion.[1] As faith grew in the intercessory functions of the saints, this power was supposed to be greatly more efficient when exercised at the tombs of the martyrs, whither the energumens were brought for the purpose of cure, and the custom of pilgrimages to shrines may be assumed to have found its origin in this.[2] There can be little doubt,

[1] Edatur hic aliquis sub tribunalibus vestris quem dæmone agi constet. Jussus a quolibet Christiano loqui spiritus ille, tam se dæmonem confitebitur de vero, quam alibi deum de falso.—Tertulliani Apol. adv. Gentes, cap. xxiii.

[2] Hieron. Epist. XLVI. §§ 8, 9.—Augustin. de Civitate Dei XXII. 8.

indeed, that in cases depending upon the imagination, the ceremonies of exorcism and the awe with which the relics of a saint were regarded had a powerful influence which was frequently beneficial, though sometimes otherwise.

Anciently, as is shown in the pas-age of Tertullian just quoted, any Christian could exorcise demons; the invocation of Christ sufficed, and no priestly ordination was requisite to give it effect. With the development of sacerdotalism, however, it was felt that this was a function to be reserved to those in holy orders, and the Council of Laodicæa, in the fourth century, laid down the rule that exorcism, whether in churches or in private houses, should be performed only by those ordained by the bishops.[1] Still the *exorcista* was one of the lowest orders of the clergy, below the acolyte, and superior only to the lector. Doubtless abuses had sprung up in the treatment of unfortunate patients by the ignorant, which the Laodicæan canon was intended to remove, but it proved insufficient, and early in the fifth century Innocent I. forbade the laying-on of hands upon the possessed, even by priests, without a special mandate from the bishop.[2]

The subject was one which was difficult to control within proper bounds. It was naturally provocative of scandals and disorder, the remedy for which was sought in limiting still more the power of exorcism. The decree of Innocent I. had been forgotten, when in 1625 the synod of Florence ordered that no one should presume to exorcise who did not hold a special faculty from the episcopal ordinary, and bishops were ordered to be discreet in granting such powers. This proved ineffectual, and in 1710 Clement XI. issued an encyclical letter, reciting the troubles arising from the multiplicity of exorcisms invented and used by exorcisers, and ordering that no priest should be admitted to practise exorcism unless known to possess the piety, integrity, prudence, and other

[1] Concil. Laodicens. c. xxvi.

[2] S. Innocent. PP. I. Epist. xxv. c. 6.

qualities required by the Roman ritual, the rules of which were to be strictly observed for the future.[1] Yet notwithstanding all this the most eminent modern theologians still hold that all Christians possess the power, as they did of old.[2]

Clement XI. might well object to many of the exorcisms in current use, for it was an accepted maxim that they must not be precatory, but be imperative and abusive in order to confound the pride of the demons.[3] Some of the formulas, in fact, were coarsely vituperative in the highest degree. The demons were addressed as infernal beasts, vile filth of hell, stinking dung and other contemptuous epithets, and were threatened that their meat and drink should be fire, hail, snow, ice, sulphur, pitch, absinth, rosin, lead, the venom of serpents, etc.[4] A more serious method of confounding them, admitted by exorcists to be efficacious, was to administer stripes and blows to the unfortunate energumen.[5] Winding a blessed stole around the neck of the patient, and tying it in a triple knot was a very efficacious procedure,[6] and contempt for the demon might advantageously be shown by writing his name on a piece of paper and burning it.[7]

[1] Ferraris, Prompta Bibliotheca, *s.v. Exorcizare.*

[2] S. Alphons. de Liguori Theol. Moralis Lib. VI. No. 805.

[3] Ferraris, *loc. cit.*

[4] Gelasii de Cilia Locupletissimus Thesaurus continens Benedictiones etc. Editio Sexta, August. Vindel. 1744, pp. 449–51.

[5] Caroli de Brancio Modus interrogandi Dæmonem, Venetiis, 1643, p. 8.

Neither of these works was placed on the Index, a fate which befell some of the more extravagant ones. That of Fra Zacaria Visconti (*Complementum Artis Exorcisticæ*), after a long career from 1537, was finally condemned by Clement XI. by decree of March 4, 1709 (Index Clementis XI. p. 94). He tells us that the pride of demons is to be overcome by opprobrious and derisive words, spitting, kicking, beating and other similar methods (Ed. Venetiis, 1643, p. 38). Menghi's well-known *Flagellum Dæmonum* and his *Compendio dell' Arte Esorcistica* were condemned in the same decree of 1709.

[6] Gelasius de Cilia, *op. cit.* p. 440.

[7] Carolus de Brancio, *op. cit.* p. 9.

There were two questions connected with diabolical possession which gave the Church much concern—fictitious cases and those of nuns. With regard to the latter, we have seen in the affair of the convent of San Plácido how the matter was complicated by the intrusion of Calderón within the sacred limits. Nunneries were naturally specially afflicted with epidemics of the affection, and scandal was caused by frequent visits of the exorciser within the cloister. Numerous regulations were issued during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries to guard against this. The episcopal ordinaries were forbidden to grant licences to anyone to enter the cloister, except for the purpose of blessing cells suspected of infection. In cases of possession a special licence was required, which was limited to a term of three, or at most six months, and only to be granted to an aged priest of high repute. The patient was to be brought into the exterior church or chapel, accompanied by female relatives or women of mature age and approved virtue; the church was to be closed, the ceremony performed with as little notoriety as possible, and on its conclusion the sufferer was to be conveyed immediately back.[1]

Even more troublesome was the question as to the reality of the possession. Imposture was easy, and, from various

[1] Ferraris, *loc. cit.*

An epidemic of possession which afflicted the Augustinian convent at Quesnoy le Conte in Flanders, in 1491, was peculiarly obstinate, lasting, according to one account, for four years and four months, and according to another, for seven years. It commenced with a nun named Jeanne Potiere, who confessed to having long had intercourse with an incubus, for which she was condemned to imprisonment in the château de Selles in such strict confinement that she speedily died. Exorcisms by the most holy men were unavailing, and we are told that the nuns ran about the fields like dogs, flew through the air like birds and scampered up trees like cats. The names of the afflicted were sent to Rome and were read in the mass by Alexander VI. himself on Holy Thursday, but to no effect, and the trouble finally ceased only by the grace of God (Paul Fredericq, Corpus Documentt. Inquis. Neerlandicæ, I. 483–6).

motives, it was of frequent occurrence. Exorcists were warned that in the majority of cases the affliction was feigned and that their first duty was to examine with the utmost care whether the possession was genuine or not. The diagnostic rules laid for their guidance reveal a curious simplicity of belief in the stupidity of the demons who could allow themselves to be thus betrayed, for their effort of course was to avert from themselves the torment of the exorcism by misleading the exorciser and inducing him to abandon his holy efforts. The sign of genuine possession most generally relied upon was the ability of the patient to understand and speak languages of which she was ignorant. Others were her familiarity with sciences previously unknown; her avoiding religious services; exposing herself to falls from a height; swelling suddenly and then returning to her natural condition; answering mental questions and obeying mental commands; remaining stiff and immovable in spite of the efforts of several men; suffering from epilepsy; refusing to utter sacred phrases; shunning the priest and exorcist; objecting to enter the church and endeavoring to leave it; refusing to look on sacred objects, casting them down and spitting on them, or, when relics were secretly placed upon her head, saying they smelt badly or were heavy, and asking to have them removed. When efforts to deceive by feigned possession were detected, the punishment to be inflicted was fasting, scourging and imprisonment in chains.[1]

In spite of these precautions imposture could scarce be guarded against, for the credulity of the exorcist was stimulated by the fact that a good case of diabolical possession made an attractive show that could be utilized for the benefit of his own reputation and that of his church, and the stimulation of popular devotion. A somewhat typical case is related in a confidential gossipy correspondence between Jesuits in 1635. A lady of quality in Valladolid, reduced to

[1] Ferraris, *loc. cit.*

want, pretended to be a demoniac in order to procure subsistance from the charity of the pious. Two rival exorcists exhausted themselves in contests over her, and crowds flocked to the church in which the performance was exhibited. This continued for a considerable period until the performer found herself unequal to the task of keeping up the deception, and confessed the truth to one of the exorcists. The affair had been too public and had attracted too much attention for the truth to be known without gravely compromising the honor of the church. The priest to whom the secret was confided was much embarrassed and consulted a Jesuit as to the course to be pursued in a business so delicate. The discreet advice was that the supposititious demons should be cast out privately. This was done; the woman was announced to be cured, and the matter was hushed up without scandal or damage to the faith.[1]

In Spain the extension of the jurisdiction of the Inquisition brought all such matters within its cognizance. There were a number of trials arising from an epidemic of possession in Queretaro in 1691, and the records of two of them, which happen to have been preserved, enable us to follow the affair in a manner which throws considerable light upon the inner history of the combination of fraud and nervous excitability usually to be found as the proximate causes of such outbreaks.[2]

In the spring of 1691 two young girls of Queretaro suffered themselves to be seduced. One of them, named Francisca Mexia, a child in her fifteenth year, lost her lover in August through a prevailing pestilence. He had promised her marriage, and in despair she threw herself into the river. She was rescued insensible, and on being restored to life explained her act by declaring that she had been seized by the hair,

[1] Cartas de Jesuitas, *Memorial Histórico Español*, T. XIII. pp. 125–38.

[2] Procesos de Francisca Mexia y Francisca de la Serna (MSS. of David Fergusson, Esq.). I reprint the account of this case from the *Journal of American Folk-Lore*, for Jan.–April, 1890.

lifted through the air, and plunged into the water. It was a clear case of sorcery and demonism; the preservation of her secret required her to keep it up, and this probably was not difficult in the nervous exaltation of her condition. She speedily presented the ordinary symptoms of diabolical possession, and the demons on being exorcised stated that they had been sent by sorceresses whose names were not revealed. About the same time, Juana de las Reyes, the other girl, found that her situation could not be much longer concealed. Probably the example of the Mexia suggested to her the same means of averting suspicion, and she forthwith commenced a similar series of performances. These were of the kind well known to demonologists—cataleptic rigidity, contortions, screams, wild and blasphemous talk, alternating with periods of rest. The sufferers would be scratched all over by invisible nails and be bitten by invisible teeth; they frequently ejected all sorts of substances from mouth and ears—stones, mud, wool, pins, paper, toads, snakes, and spiders. One witness gravely declared that, while watching one of them, she saw the patient's eyes intently fixed on an enormous spider upon the opposite wall; she crossed the room to examine it, and as she looked, it gradually diminished in size and disappeared without moving from the spot.

Although the demons kept silence as to the names of the sorceresses who sent them, the girls had visions in which they frequently saw women. One who repeatedly appeared to them was a Mestiza named Josepha Ramos, commonly called *Chuparatones*, or Mouse-sucker, employed in an apothecary shop. They did not accuse her of being the cause of their suffering, but the mere fact of seeing her was enough. She was arrested by the secular magistrate and claimed by the Inquisition, which immured her in its secret prison in Mexico, where a chance allusion shows that she was still lying in 1694 with her trial unfinished. I have not the papers of her case and do not know its result, but the Spanish Inquisition was not in the habit of burning witches; its decision as to the so-

called diabolical possession scarce justified Josepha's detention, and she probably escaped after prolonged imprisonment due to the customary delays of inquisitorial procedure. Three other women were also arrested on suspicion of sorcery, but do not seem to have been tried.

The first treatment resorted to with the possessed was to call in certain Indian wise women, who performed inunction with herbs, producing delirium and stupor without relief. Then the church was appealed to, and Fray Pablo Sarmiento, guardian of the Franciscan convent, came with his friars, and an active course of exorcism was pursued. The *Padres Apostólicos* also took a hand. Public attention was aroused, and effective means were employed to make the most of the opportunity for the edification of the people. Mission services were held at night in the churches, which were filled with curious and excited crowds, eager to witness the performances of the demoniacs and the impressive solemnities of exorcism; and as the attraction increased, the mission in the church of Santa Cruz was kept up all day. A great religious procession was organized in which the women walked barefoot, and the men scourged themselves. Every effort was made to stimulate religious exaltation, with the natural result. The patients steadily grew worse, and the arts of the exorciser proved fruitless. On one occasion Fray Pablo imagined for a moment that he had won a victory in casting out two hundred demons who had been sent by sorcerers, but they were immediately replaced by two hundred fresh ones sent by God. What at first was merely imposture, doubtless grew to be, in some degree at least, pathological, as the nerves of the girls became affected by the prolonged excitement. What was more deplorable was that the contagious character of the affection was stimulated to the utmost under the most favorable conditions. At almost every evening service of exorcism some one in the crowd would be carried out convulsed and shrieking, to be at once submitted to a course of exorcism and be converted into a confirmed

demoniac. The number grew until it amounted to fourteen —not all of the gentler sex, for we hear of an old man and a boy who were subjected to such active treatment of fumigations of sulphur and incense by the friars that they died, each declaring with his last breath that he was not possessed, which was explained to be merely an astute trick of the demons to create infidel unbelief.

The epidemic would doubtless have been much more severe had all the ecclesiastics encouraged it, but fortunately they were not unanimous. The Franciscans and Apostólicos had succeeded in monopolizing the affair, and in the traditional jealousy between the various religious orders those which were excluded were necessarily rendered antagonistic. The Dominicans and the Jesuits even, for a moment, forgot their mortal enmity, and they were joined by the Carmelites, in spite of the deadly battle which at that time was raging between them and the Jesuits over the *Acta Sanctorum* and Father Papenbroek. These made common cause in denouncing the whole affair as fraudulent, and they carried with them a portion of the secular and parochial clergy. Passions on both sides were aroused, the pulpits rang with the clangor of disputation, the people took sides with one party or the other, and in the heat of controversy serious tumults appeared inevitable. In November and December both sides appealed to the Inquisition of Mexico, asking its interposition in their favor. With its customary dilatoriness it postponed action until an unexpected development occurred. Fray Pablo Sarmiento testifies that at 8 P. M., on January 2, 1692, he visited Juana de las Reyes and exorcised her, when she ejected from her mouth pins and wool and paper, and he left her as one dead. On reaching his convent he was told that a friar had been hastily sent for, as she was dying; the friar was not long absent, and on returning secretly informed Fray Pablo that Juana had just given birth to a boy. At first he was dumbfounded, but became greatly consoled on remembering that the *Malleus Maleficarum* provides for such cases,

which are not infrequent, by informing us how the demon succeeds in producing such results in a perfectly innocent demoniac. He hastened to Juana's bedside, and in presence of the commissioner of the Inquisition, and of notaries whom he summoned, he questioned her demon, Masambique, and received the most satisfactory assurances, more curious than decent, confirming his theory. The demon, moreover, informed him that two other demoniacs, one of them being Francisca Mexia, were in the same predicament, and would bring forth children in about two months. Fray Pablo returned to his convent, but had scarce more than reached it when word was brought him that the Mexia was about to be confined. Naturally provoked at this untoward coincidence, he at first refused to go to her, but charity prevailed and he went. Her demon, Fongo Bonito, confirmed the fact, described a different process which he had employed, and said that the birth would not occur for a couple of months. It proved a false alarm, arising from hysterical tympanites, for the Mexia escaped exposure and never had a child.

This *contretemps* might have been expected to end the delusion, but it only stimulated the good *frailes* to fresh efforts to maintain their position against the sarcastic comments of their adversaries. The children were all miraculous. The one just born had made all hell tremble as he came into the world; he was marked with the letter R in token that he was to be named Raphael; the one to be born of the Mexia would be marked M, to indicate his name of Miguel; a girl seven years of age, one of the possessed, would bring forth another marked F, whose name was to be Francisco IV.—the worthy successor of the three Francises, of Assisi, Paola, and Sales. All these infants in time were to perform immense service to the church.

It was quite time for the Inquisition to interfere. The combined influence of the Jesuits, Dominicans, and Carmelites triumphed. On December 19, a *Junta de Calificadores* had been held, which, although it contained two Franciscans,

unanimously came to the conclusion that the demoniacal possession was fraudulent, and that the blasphemies and sacrilegious acts committed by the possessed, and the violent sermons of the friars, were justiciable by the Holy Office. Accordingly on January 9, 1692, a decree was issued peremptorily ordering the cessation of all exorcism, and of all discussion of the subject, whether in the pulpit or in private. The effect was magical. The excitement died away, and the possessed, for the most part, deprived of the stimulus of exorcism and of the attention which their antics had attracted, were speedily cured when left to themselves. Prosecutions were commenced against four of them, and against a Franciscan, Fray Matheo de Bonilla, which dragged along perfunctorily for a few years and seem to have been finally suspended.

All, however, did not escape so easily. Some nervous organizations are too susceptible to undergo agitation so profound without permanent alteration. One of the earliest to sympathize with the demoniacal movement was a girl named Francisca de la Serna, then about eighteen years of age. In her simple zeal she prayed that God's will be done with her, and that she should suffer if it was his pleasure, whereupon Lucifer himself, with a thousand attendant demons, had entered into her. She was one of those against whom prosecutions were directed; the Inquisition consequently kept an eye on her, and we are able to follow her case. In October, 1692, a report was ordered concerning her, by which we learn that she was in the utmost misery, bodily and mental —absolutely penniless, incapable of self-support, and dependent on the charity of one or two neighbors. She is described as being in the same state as before the exorcisms were stopped. Sometimes she lies quiet and speechless like a corpse; then she will be furious and blaspheme the Virgin and the saints, and talk insanely; then she will come to her senses, weeping and begging God's mercy and uttering prayers of tender devotion. She was evidently the victim

of recurring hysterical attacks, sometimes epileptiform and sometimes maniacal. A year passed away, when in October, 1693, the Inquisition ordered her placed under the spiritual direction of the Rector of the Jesuit College, with power to employ exorcisms, and to report at his convenience whether she was feigning, or was possessed, or was suffering from natural disease. After careful examination the shrewd Jesuit, Father Bernardo Rolandegui, reported that she was not and never had been possessed, and that this was now her own belief. She sometimes became suddenly dumb, while retaining all her senses, but this was attributable to her having at first been told that it would be so, or from some humors that caused it, or from deceit, or from sorcery. No exorcisms, he said, had been deemed necessary. The next we hear of her is in 1699, when the commissioner at Queretaro applied to the Inquisition for permission to have her exorcised. He describes her as completely under demoniacal possession; the last attack had lasted for ten days; she is dumb and crippled and suffers acutely. The disease was evidently advancing apace, but the Inquisition held good, and merely ordered her to be put under the direction of the Jesuit rector, Phelipe de la Mora, who had succeeded Bernardo Rolandegui. Then for ten years we hear no more of her. The last scene of the tragedy is set forth in a petition from the Jesuit rector, Juan Antonio Perez de Espinosa, in 1709, begging to be released from the charge. Three years before he had made this request and it had received no attention. She daily crawls to his church and occupies his time, interfering with his studies and his duties in the confessional. Exorcisms do her no good, but she occasionally finds relief from blowing in her face, or from saliva applied to the eyes or to the heart. Sometimes she is blind, sometimes deaf, sometimes crippled and always weak-minded. From numerous experiments he is convinced that it is not diabolical possession, but the influence of the imagination, unless indeed there may be imposture to work upon the compassion of the charitable man who has supported

her since 1692. Her case had evidently become one of chronic hysterical hypochondriasis, and her end can only have been complete dementia, unless she was mercifully relieved by death.

We have seen in the preceding essay how much trouble was frequently caused to ecclesiastics by pretended demoniacs. This is illustrated by another case, of no special importance in itself except as showing how large a space demoniacal possession occupied in many minds.[1] In Oaxaca a girl named Teresa Patiño asserted that she was persecuted by the spirit of a dead man. In answer to her application for relief Fray Caietano Nuñez, a Dominican, was sent to her, when she said that the ghost was endeavoring to get nine or twelve masses sung for him which would rescue him from hell. Fray Nuñez recognized it at once as a deceit and told her to recommend the spirit to come to his cell and to bring the money with him, as he was not accustomed to celebrate gratuitously. Finding thus that her fiction was unprofitable, she changed it in 1792 to diabolical possession and in this she was more successful. Another Dominican, Fray Manuel Gorvea, became interested in her. He was a man of learning and of irreproachable life, but he became so wrapped up in the case that he could talk of little else than possession; when his superior forbade his longer attendance upon her, he visited her secretly by night, and stories were circulated, not unnaturally, of her being pregnant by him, a condition which Gorvea described as the work of the devil to discredit the church. She was generally regarded as an impostor, and failed when tested with strange languages, but nothing could shake his belief. This continued for six years, when in 1798 another Dominican, Fray Antonio Pavon, denounced him to the Inquisition, which made secret inquiries into the matter.

[1] Proceso del Maestro Fr. Manuel Gorvea (MSS. of David Fergusson, Esq.).

Teresa's brother, José Patiño, was also a Dominican, and prior of the nunnery of *Religiosas Catarinas* of Oaxaca. He and Gorvea were great friends and were equally zealous as exorcisers. The nuns of the convent were many of them hysterical, and Fray Patiño excited unfavorable comment by the freedom with which he penetrated within the cloister to perform the function of exorcising demons in which no one else believed.

Fray Gorvea rose to be vicar of the Order; he declined the priorship of Tehuantepec and finally in 1799 he was elected Provincial. Though he was accused of being still too fond of frequenting nunneries, his interest in Teresa Patiño declined and she settled the matter by running away with a weaver named José María. The case dragged on in the Inquisition until 1805, when it seems to have been dropped without any decision being reached. The evidence against Gorvea was not particularly strong, the irreligious principles of the French Revolution were penetrating the people and rendering the rulers of Church and State anxious, and there was little to be gained from the scandal of arresting and prosecuting a Provincial of the great Dominican Order.

The moral to be drawn from these ca es is that the prudent precautions of the Church, in strictly limiting the function of exorcism to priests of learning and experience, are an insufficient protection against the arts of a designing or hysterical woman.[1]

[1] Todos los exorcistas reciben en su ordinacion esta potestad; sin embargo la Iglesia solo permite que la ejerzan los Sacerdotes de grande instruccion y experiencia. Se trata de un asunto muy delicado y, para evitar fraudes y abusos, la Iglesia, siempre tan prudente, ha dispuesto que no conjuren los exorcistas inexpertos que pudieran ser facilmente engañados ó alucinados.—Sanchez, Pron'uario de la Theologia Moral, Madrid, 1878, p. 268.

EL SANTO NIÑO DE LA GUARDIA.[1]

The expulsion of the Jews from Spain, by the edict of 31 March, 1492, marked the triumph of the policy of intolerance which reached its culmination in the banishment of the Moriscos, 1609–13, and crippled the Spanish monarchy by depriving it of its most industrious subjects. In January, 1481, the Inquisition had commenced its work in Seville, its primary, or rather its virtually sole, object being to detect and punish the secret judaizing of the numerous *conversos*, or New Christians, who had multiplied so greatly since the massacres of 1391. The operations of the Inquisition could not fail to put an end to conversions, for the Jew, by reason of his judaism, was not subject to its jurisdiction, while the *converso*, having been baptized, was a member of the church, and any secret leaning to the rites and ceremonies of his ancestors, however innocent in themselves, was relentlessly punished. The Jews, who naturally looked with contempt upon the Meschunadim, or *conversos*, as apostates, for whose destruction they uttered prayers thrice a day,[2] could regard their sufferings with complacency and feel that, amid the numberless oppressions to which they were themselves exposed, they were at least shielded from this new and dreadful danger by sturdy adherence to the law of Moses. On the other hand, the inquisitor could not but recognize that, while his zeal was weeding out the tares from among the New Christians, it was postponing indefinitely all realization of the hope that on Spanish soil Israel would eventually be

[1] Reprinted from the *English Historical Review*, April, 1889.

[2] Alonso de Spina, Fortalicium Fidei, ed. 1494, fol. cxlviii.

brought wholly within the fold of Christ. In the existing insane hatred of judaism, moreover, it was intolerable to him to see the vast body of Jews scattered through the land practising their abhorred rites under the protection of the laws, and exempt from his jurisdiction save in the rare cases when they could be charged with proselytism, sorcery, or other spiritual offences.

That Torquemada and his subordinates should eagerly press upon Ferdinand and Isabella some comprehensive measure which should rid the land of this reproach was therefore inevitable, and the only measure which seemed adequate to the end in view was that of offering to the Jews the alternative of conversion or exile. The Jews had been banished from England in 1290, and had never subsequently been allowed to return.[1] The same experiment had been tried more than once in France, although the exclusion had been but temporary.[2] In Germany the fifteenth century had witnessed their exclusion from one state after another.[3] In Spain, however, although a partial recourse to this expedient had been had in Andalusia between 1480 and 1490,[4] the numbers, wealth, and social importance of the Jews rendered a general measure of the kind a matter of highest statecraft, to be maturely weighed, and the sovereigns hesitated long. It is a suggestive fact that, whenever a decision was needed in favor of the faith, some opportune revelation occurred to hasten it. Isabella's doubts as to the introduction of the

[1] Matt. Westmonastrens. ann. 1290.

[2] Rigordus de Gestis Phil. Aug. ann. 1182.—Guill. Nangiac. Contin. ann. 1306.

[3] The Jews were driven from Saxony in 1432, from Spires and Zürich in 1435, from Mayence in 1438, from Augsburg in 1439, from Bavaria in 1450, from Würzburg in 1453, from Brünn and Olmütz in 1454, from Schweidnitz in 1457, from Erfurt in 1458, from Neisse in 1468, from the archiepiscopal province of Mayence in 1470.—Janssen, Geschichte des deutschen Volkes, I. 403 (Freiburg i. B., 1887).

[4] Pulgar, Chronica, P. II. cap. lxxvii. This expulsion from Andalusia is alluded to in the general edict of 1492.

Inquisition were removed by the apparently fortuitous discovery of an assembly of judaizing New Christians in Seville.[1] Her scruples and those of Ferdinand as to the expulsion of the Jews were shaken by the incident of the Santo Niño de la Guardia, which came to light in the very nick of time, when the approaching downfall of the kingdom of Granada gave promise that the whole peninsula, from sea to sea, would be under the unquestioned domination of the cross. This celebrated case, which has been embroidered with so many marvellous legendary details, can at length be studied with some approach to scientific accuracy, through the publication by Padre Fidel Fita, S.J., in the *Boletin de la Real Academia de la Historia* for July–September, 1887, of the records of the trial of one of the victims by the Inquisition of Ávila.

To understand it we must remember that for many centuries there has existed a belief, popularized in Chaucer's "Prioress's Tale," that a favorite Jewish expression of hatred for Christianity consisted in crucifying on Good Friday a Christian child, with a repetition of the insults and contempt lavished upon Christ in the Passion. The earliest recorded foundation for this is an occurrence related in 415, when, at Inmestar, a town between Antioch and Chalcis, some Jews in a drunken frolic tied a Christian boy to a cross, and mocked and jeered at him until their savage jocularity grew to fury, and they beat him to death, for which Theodosius II. inflicted condign punishment.[2] We hear no more of it until the eleventh century, when the Jews of Chieti were accused of making a waxen image of Christ, which they transpierced with knives. The image was solemnly carried to the church, the synagogue was torn down, and the participants in the affair were punished.[3] As intolerance grew stronger, and as popular hatred towards the proscribed race became more intense, stories of this kind multiply and assume the form

[1] Paramo de Orig. Offic. S. Inquisit. p. 134.

[2] Socrat. H. E. lib. VII. cap. xvi.

[3] Depping, Les Juifs dans le Moyen-âge, Paris, 1834, p. 152.

which subsequently characterizes them. In 1144 we are told that a boy named William was crucified at Norwich.[1] At Easter, 1171, the Jews of Blois crucified a boy, for which Thiebault, count of Chartres, burnt all who refused to be baptized, and not long after a similar occurrence is reported as taking place at Gloucester.[2] The terrible massacres which followed the coronation of Richard I., September, 1189, continuing at intervals throughout England during the following year, sought justification in tales of the same kind.[3] Perhaps better authenticated was a case occurring, in 1192, at Bray-sur-Seine, where the Jews by heavy bribes obtained from the countess a Christian accused of theft and murder, whom they scourged through the streets, with a crown of thorns on his head, and then hanged—a parody of the Passion which Philip Augustus promptly avenged by burning eighty or more of them.[4] In 1235 the Jews of Norwich were again accused —this time of circumcising a boy and keeping him for a year with the intention of crucifying him, and on proper means being used they confessed the crime before Henry III.[5] In 1250 we meet the first case recorded in Spain—that of San Domenguito de Val, a young chorister of Saragossa, whose crucifixion was revealed by a miraculous light shining over his grave, though the protection afforded by King Jayme I. shielded the perpetrators from merited punishment.[6] It was probably the excitement caused by this affair that led Alfonso X. of Castile soon afterwards, in his code of "Las Siete Partidas," to allude to such crimes as ascribed to the Jews.[7] In 1255 occurred the well-known case of Hugh of Lincoln.[8]

[1] Radulf. de Coggeshall Chron. ann. 1144.

[2] Nic. Trivetti Chron. ann. 1171.

[3] Radulf. de Coggeshall Chron. ann. 1189.

[4] Rigordus de Gest. Phil. Aug. ann. 1192.

[5] Matt. Paris, ann. 1235.

[6] José Amado de los Rios, Hist. de los Judios de España, III. 318.—Lindo, History of the Jews of Spain, p. 86.

[7] Partidas, VII. xxiv. 2.

[8] Nic. Trivetti Chron. ann. 1255.

In 1282 a similar crime ascribed to the Jews of Munich led to a massacre in which a hundred and eighty were burnt in a synagogue where they had taken refuge, undeterred by which their descendants repeated the offence in 1345.[1] In 1303 a case is recorded in Thuringia; in 1305 at Prague;[2] and in 1331 at Ueberlingen the finding of the corpse of a child caused the burning of three hundred Jews, a massacre which the Emperor Louis of Bavaria sternly avenged.[3] In 1410 the Jews of Misnia purchased a boy from a peasant for the purpose of sacrificing him; the matter became divulged, the peasant was broken on the wheel and quartered, while the Jews were banished from Misnia and Thuringia, and all their property was confiscated.[4] In 1435, at Palma, in Majorca, the leading members of the Aljama, or Jewish community, were accused of parodying the Passion with a Moorish slave, but without putting him to death; torture brought confession, when many Jews fled to the mountains of Lluch to escape the wrath of the mob, but were captured and thrown into gaol. They submitted to baptism, their example was followed by the other prisoners and then by the whole synagogue. The solemn ceremony of this happy conversion so wrought upon the feelings of the people that they begged the lives of the convicts, and after some difficulty obtained their pardon.[5] In 1454 a case occurred at Valladolid which contained the germs of much future trouble. A child was robbed of the ornaments he wore, was slain, and was buried in the fields, where dogs scratched up the body. The Jews were accused, and Alonso de Espina tells us that they had ripped out its heart, burnt it, and mixed the ashes with wine to form an unholy sacrament; and that, although a Jew confessed under torture, bribery of King Henry IV. and of the judges pro-

[1] Aventini Annal. Boior. lib. VII. cap. x. No. 11; cap. xix. No. 13.
[2] Eisenmenger, Entdecktes Judenthum, P. II. p. 220.
[3] Vitodurani Chron. ann. 1331.
[4] Raynaldi Annal. ann. 1410, No. 31.
[5] Vicente Mut, Hist. Gen. de Mallorca, ed. 1841, III. 384.

cured his acquittal. Alonso, however, succeeded in arousing great excitement by preaching on the subject in Valladolid during the progress of the trial.[1] Fed by such stories as this, popular hatred of the Jews was steadily rising, as was shown by the next case, in 1468, at Sepúlveda, where the rabbi, Solomon Pico, and the leaders of the synagogue were accused of crucifying a child during Holy Week. Juan Arias de Ávila, bishop of Segovia, arrested sixteen of those most deeply implicated, of whom some perished in the flames, and the rest were hanged, except a boy who begged to be baptized. Even this did not satisfy the zeal of the Sepúlvedans, who slew some of the remaining Jews and drove the rest away.[2] A case soon afterwards, at Trent, in 1472, illustrates the growth of the popular beliefs which heightened these affairs with constantly more revolting details, for during the inquisition held on it a converted Jew testified that it was customary for his people to slay a Christian child at Passover and to mingle its blood with their wine and with the dough of the unleavened bread.[3] At Ratisbon, in 1486, no fewer than six children were said to have been thus sacrificed in a single holocaust.[4] In 1509 there was a case in Hungary, and in 1540 one at Titingen, which the Lutheran count palatine, Otho Henry, irreligiously refused to investigate; and when the pious Hilbrand Thiermar abused him in a poem, he had the audacious poet's tongue cut out—though it miraculously grew again.[5] That Rome had no belief in the truth of these stories is indicated by the fact that in the ferocious bull of Gregory XIII. in 1581, enumerating the offences for which Jews were to be subjected to the jurisdiction of the Inquisition,

[1] Alonso de Spina, Fortalic. Fidei, fol. cxlvi.

[2] Colmenares, Historia de Segovia, cap. xxxiii. § 2.

[3] Eisenmenger, *loc. cit.* In the case of a Christian girl whose murder by the Jews at Forchheim in 1261 was revealed by a miracle, the object as stated was only to collect the blood (Cornel. Zanfliet Chron. ann. 1261).

[4] Raderi Bavaria Sancta III. 172. Raphael Sadeler, the prince of engravers of his day, embellishes this narrative with a very effective print.

[5] Ibid. III. 176.

there is no mention of crucifying children, although a modified form of the crime is described, in which a lamb was affixed to a cross and spit upon or otherwise insulted.[1] Cases now become rarer; at Caaden there was one, 11 March, 1650, which met with speedy punishment, for in ten days the guilty Jew was broken on the wheel; and there was another at Metz in 1669, for which Raphael Levi was burnt alive. This is the last instance which the industry of Eisenmenger enabled him to discover; writing in 1711 he says that the crime is no longer heard of, owing to the rigor of its suppression, and not to any abatement of Jewish hatred of Christians. He considers it doubtful whether the Jews really mingled Christian blood with the Passover bread, in view of the Mosaic commands against eating blood; but he places faith in another explanation which had already been advanced by Dr. John Eck, the antagonist of Luther—that a Hebrew woman in labor could not bring forth without the application of Christian blood.[2] Another theory, advanced in the seventeenth century by a learned Portuguese, was that all Jews on Easter-day were afflicted with a bloody flux, for which the only remedy was Christian blood.[3]

If Eisenmenger believed that the world would hear no more of this, he underrated the persistence of human credulity and intolerance. In 1874, at Kilmasti Cassaba, in Asia Minor, the Greek inhabitants stimulated an active persecution of the Jews by the Turkish authorities on the accusation of having sacrificed two Christian children who had disappeared, and who, as was found on investigation, had been murdered by a Turk. In 1881 at Alexandria the Greeks accused the Jews of killing a Greek boy as a Passover sacrifice. The child had disappeared and in a few days its body

[1] Septimi Decretal. lib. v. tit. i. c. 5.

[2] Eisenmenger, *op. cit.* ii. 224–7.—Bavaria Sancta III. 172.

[3] Vicente da Costa Mattos, Breve Discurso contra a heretica Perfidia do Judaismo, Lisboa, 1623, fol. 131.

was found floating in the harbor; medical examination showed that it had suffered no violence, but the Greeks set upon the Jews, of whom a few were killed and many wounded and a general massacre was threatened. Still more striking as a survival of medieval beliefs was the case of Esther Salomassy at Tizla-Eszlar, in Hungary, in 1882, when her disappearance was followed by the arrest of the chief Jews of the synagogue on the charge of having murdered her for the purpose of mingling her blood with the Passover bread. It will be remembered that the principal witnesses in this case were two boys, one of five and the other of fourteen years, sons of Josef Scharf, beadle of the synagogue and one of the accused; that the local authorities used every effort to secure conviction, including torture of some of those implicated and persecution of the witnesses for the defence; and that, when the superior officials intervened and showed that the accused were innocent, popular excitement could with difficulty be suppressed. The implicit belief in the Jewish Passover sacrifice of a Christian child was manifested during the present year, 1890, at Smyrna, where two Greeks offered the Grand Rabbi, Abraham Palacci, to procure a young girl with that object for about $7500. Their proposals were entertained for the purpose of entrapping them, which was successfully accomplished, and they were arrested.[1]

Closely related to this belief in Christian victims at the Passover was another, that the Jews were constantly endeavoring to obtain consecrated hosts in order to wreak on them their vengeance against Christ. The usual story was that the Jews would stab the host with knives, when it would spout forth blood. In 1289 a Jew popularly known as *le bon juif*,

[1] The wide extent of such beliefs is illustrated by the occurrence, so recently as June 20, 1888, in Seoul, the capital of Corea, of a rising against the American missionaries, who were accused of purchasing children and boiling them down to make medicines. The lives of the missionaries were saved by the authorities, but nine native officials, said to have been implicated in the sale of the children, were seized by the mob and publicly beheaded.

was burnt at Paris for thus maltreating a host procured from a woman who had swallowed and vomited it.[1] In 1338 there was a terrible massacre in the diocese of Passau, occasioned by a layman finding a wafer stained with blood near the house of a Jew; there was no evidence that it had been consecrated, but the populace leapt to the conclusion that it had been abused in the unholy rites of judaism. Duke Albert of Austria was much puzzled, and applied for instructions to Benedict XII., stating that similar occurrences had recently happened at Sintz, at Nirmiburg, and at Werchartshof, in at least one of which cases it had been proved that an ecclesiastic had arranged the affair in order to excite enmity against the Jews. One of these cases is doubtless the same as that related by the Franciscan John of Winterthur, which affords a possible explanation of their frequent occurrence. He tells us that about 1336 in Austria a knavish priest, to gain money, excited a fierce persecution of the Jews by sprinkling a wafer with blood and throwing it near some Jews, where it was picked up and brought back to his church. Crowds came to worship it, and their oblations were as productive as he desired. A confederate betrayed him and he was thrown into prison, not for wronging the Jews, but because he had caused the sin of idolatry among his people by leading them to worship an unconsecrated host. He escaped by bribing his bishop.[2] In 1379 Wenceslas of Brabant burnt at Brussels a Jew who had obtained sixteen hosts and had transfixed them with a knife, when they dropped blood. Three of these were preserved in the church of St. Gudule, at least till the sixteenth century; they worked many miracles, and were carried in the procession at the feast of Corpus Christi. In 1399, at Posen, some Jews obtained a host and stabbed it with knives, when the blood which spurted forth stained their faces indelibly. They buried it in a field, but birds

[1] Grandes Chroniques, éd. Paulin, Paris, t. V. p. 100.

[2] Raynaldi Annal. ann. 1338, No. 19–21.—Vitodurani Cronicon ann. 1336.

kept flying over the spot and oxen knelt around it till the attention of the magistrates was attracted; it was dug up and performed miracles; the criminals were discovered and were slowly burnt to death tied to dogs, who tore them as the flames advanced.[1] More serious in its results was a similar affair in Segovia in 1410, where the Jews obtained from the sacristan of San Fagun a consecrated host as security for a loan which he desired to raise—the street where the bargain was made obtaining the name of *Calle del Mal Consejo.* The Jews threw it into a boiling cauldron, when it rose and remained suspended in the air. This miracle, repeated several times, so impressed some of those present that they were converted; they carried the host to the Dominican convent and told the story, when the Dominicans piously administered the host in communion to a child, who died in three days. The queen-regent, Doña Catalina, happened to be in Segovia, and had the affair rigorously investigated. One of the accused was Don Mayr, royal physician and perhaps the most prominent member of his race in Spain. Under torture he confessed not only his participation in this sacrilege, but also that he had poisoned the late King Henry III. The participants in the matter were all dragged through the streets and quartered, as likewise were others who in revenge endeavored to poison the Bishop of Segovia, Juan de Tordesillas; the Jewish synagogue was converted into the church of Corpus Christi, and an annual procession still perpetuates the memory of the event. It affords another instance of the fortunate coincidence of such affairs with measures in preparation against the Jews, for it gave San Vincente Ferrer assistance in procuring the proscriptive laws known as the *Ordenamiento de Doña Catalina,* of 1412.[2] So recently as

[1] Raynaldi Annal. ann. 1338, No. 19–21; ann. 1399, No. 2.

[2] Fortalicium Fidei, fol. clxxii.–iii.—Colmenares, Hist. de Segovia, cap. xxviii. §§ 6–8.—Garibay, Compendio Historial de España, lib. xv. c. 58.—

1556 a number of Jews were burnt at Lovitz in Poland for being concerned in a similar sacrilege, in which the host when stabbed spouted forth abundant blood.[1]

The Jews, moreover, were accused of desiring to obtain consecrated hosts, not only for the purpose of thus insulting them, but also of using their supernatural powers for the destruction of Christianity. The superstition of the day attributed to the sacred wafer the most potent magical properties, and it was constantly employed in the operations of sorcerers. To suppose that Jews would partake of this belief required an incredible stretch of credulity, but even this was not lacking. Commingled with it was the idea that with the heart of a Christian a Jewish magician could work immeasurable mischief. Alonso de Espina gravely tells us that in a certain province of France a Jew promised the executioner ten crowns for a human heart, saying that he needed it to perform a cure for which he would receive twenty. From the next criminal whom he had to dismember the executioner took the heart and handed it to his wife, telling her how it would fetch him ten crowns. She knew the Jew to be a sorcerer, and suggested that they should substitute the heart of a hog, which was done. The Jew worked his spells over it and buried it in a field, whereupon all the hogs of the province came rushing to the spot, and fought each other with such fury that not one was left alive. This led to the arrest of the Jew, who confessed that if it had been a man's heart all the Christians would have done the same, whereupon the king put to death all the Jews of the province.[2]

Wild as these stories seem to us, they were stern realities to the men of those times, by whom they were implicitly believed. They were an ever-present weapon by which ma-

Rodrigo, Historia Verdadera de la Inquisición, II. 44.—Crónica de Juan II. año v. c. 22.

[1] Laur. Surii Comment. Rer. Gestar. ann. 1556 (Colon. 1586, p. 487).

[2] Fortalicium Fidei, fol. cxliii.

lignity or craft or superstitious zeal could at any moment inflame popular wrath against the unfortunate race to which these hideous practices were ascribed. If Torquemada desired to overcome the scruples of prince and people, the means were ready to his hand.

About June 1, 1490, a converted Jew named Benito García was returning from a pilgrimage to Compostella. He had been baptized about thirty-five years before, and he attributed the misfortunes which overtook him to the curse uttered against him by his father on his abandonment of his ancestral religion. For thirty years he had persisted in the faith, but on his trial he was brought to confess that five years previously he had been secretly reconverted to judaism, and had practised Jewish rites when he could do so in safety. When he reached Astorga on his homeward journey, he chanced to lodge in a house where there was a party of drunken men. These pulled open his knapsack and found in it a consecrated wafer, when they at once stigmatized him as a heretic and delivered him to the ecclesiastical authorities. There was no tribunal of the Inquisition at Astorga, but the provisor, or episcopal vicar, Doctor Pedro de Villada, was zealous and experienced in such matters. Recognising that some important mystery was involved he set promptly and vigorously to work with inquisitorial methods. Two hundred lashes failed to elicit an explanation. Then he tried the water-torture, which was exceedingly severe: the patient being bound tightly to a frame in which his head was lower than his feet, the sharp cords around his limbs were twisted with a winch until they cut deeply into the flesh, producing almost insufferable pain, which frequently sufficed to wring from him the desired confession. When this failed a still more efficacious torment was superadded. Still bound to the trestle, his nostrils were plugged, and a jet of water was sent down his throat carrying with it a strip of linen, which was drawn out from time to time to prevent complete suffocation, and to give him an oppor-

tunity to signify his readiness to confess.[1] Finally, on another night, Benito was twice subjected to the 'garrote'—which probably means the torture of the cord without the water. Under this energetic treatment, which promised to be endless, Benito's tongue was loosened by June 6. As he subsequently remarked to a fellow-prisoner, he told more than he knew, and enough to burn him. We have not his confession, but from the subsequent proceedings it probably was that he and others, whom he named, had been engaged in a conjuration with a human heart and a consecrated host, whereby, as in Alonso de Espina's story, all Christians would die raving mad and the Jews would obtain their wealth, Christianity would be destroyed, and judaism would reign supreme.[2]

This was quite sufficient for the moment, and placed the affair within the jurisdiction of the Inquisition. Its organization was already perfect enough to enable it to act promptly, and when the information was laid before the inquisitor general, Torquemada, he lost no time in arresting those designated by Benito as his accomplices, who were all in prison at Segovia, and their property duly sequestrated, by about the first of July. The accused, besides Benito García, were Juan de Ocaña, Alonso Franco, Lope Franco, García Franco, and Juan Franco, of the town of La Guardia, all *conversos*, or New Christians, together with two Jews, Jucé Franco, of Tembleque, and Mosé Abenamías, of Zamora. Besides these,

[1] This was a form of torture extensively in use. Not long before, François Villon describes it as applied to himself:

"Se fusse des hoirs Hue Capel
Qui fut extraict de boucherie,
Ou ne m' eust, parmy ce drapel,
Faict boyre à celle eschorcherie."

An occasional modification consisted in forcing the water out again by blows on the stomach with a paddle.

[2] Fidel Fita, El Proceso y Quema de Jucé Franco (Boletin de la Real Academia de la Historia, tom. XI. Jul.–Set. 1887, pp. 13, 34, 47, 60, 115, *sqq.*).

Don Ça Franco, father of Jucé, an old man of eighty, was subsequently included as an accomplice, and there were three other Jews, recently dead, Mosé Franco, a brother of Jucé, Juçá Tazarte, and David de Perejón, who were implicated, and whose memories were prosecuted.[1]

Padre Fidel Fita has been unable to obtain the records of all the trials. Señor José Amador de los Rios states that they are in the archives of the Inquisition of Toledo, preserved at Alcalá de Henares, where he examined them in 1845; but if so, they have meanwhile disappeared, and the errors which Señor los Rios makes in his brief account of the affair would seem to indicate that he had probably been misled by an official summary of the matter drawn up by three secretaries of the Inquisition in 1569.[2] The trial of Jucé Franco is the only one which Padre Fita has discovered; but as this contains excerpts from the others of such testimony as served to incriminate the accused, it affords material for appreciating the whole, especially as Padre Fita has appended all other existent documentary evidence.

Shortly after his incarceration at Segovia Jucé Franco, in July, 1490, fell dangerously sick and despaired of recovery, though he was unhappily reserved for a harsher fate. Antonio de Ávila was introduced in his cell as a physician, and Jucé begged him to send a rabbi who could administer to him the death-bed consolations of his religion. The opportunity of entrapping the apparently dying man into revealing what he had hitherto denied was too good to be lost—possibly it had been arranged for—and the inquisitor, Fray Fernando de Santo Domingo, sent him a learned *fraile*, the Maestro Alonso Henriquez, who was familiar with Hebrew, and who, duly disguised, was brought to him as Rabbi Abraham, while Antonio de Ávila, who had some knowledge of the language,

1 Boletin, t. IX. pp. 466–8; t. XI. pp. 10, 43–44, 50.

2 José Amador de los Rios, Hist. de los Judíos de España, Madrid, 1876, III. 318.—Fidel Fita, Boletin, XI. 133.—Martínez Moreno, Historia del Martirio del Santo Niño de la Guardia, Madrid, 1866, pp. 120, *sqq*.

was stationed as an eavesdropping witness. The fictitious rabbi asked his penitent the cause of his imprisonment, and solemnly impressed on him the necessity of unburdening his conscience of the whole truth; but Jucé only stated that he was charged with crucifying a child. Something was said, either by one or the other, about obtaining the intervention of Don Abraham Senior, the Rabb Mayor, whose influence with King Ferdinand was deservedly great, and the pretended rabbi withdrew disappointed. At the request of the inquisitor, some eight or ten days later, he repeated the visit, but Jucé manifested great fear of him and would say nothing. Clever as was the plot, it failed, but it affords us an insight into the methods of the Inquisition, and its failure gives reasonable grounds for the inference that Jucé really had nothing to confess.[1]

These preliminary investigations were carried on at Segovia until about November, when the case was transferred to Ávila, where also there was a regular subordinate tribunal of the Inquisition. Torquemada, in founding his noble Dominican convent of San Tomás in the suburbs of Ávila, had taken care to provide in it all the necessary accommodations for the Holy Office. Rodrigo tells us that the cells devoted to the detention of prisoners were the sunniest and airiest in the building, but he does not mention that Torquemada's foresight had supplied another equally necessary structure in a *casa del tormento*.[2] In the convent we find assembled for the trial three special inquisitors, Dr. Pedro de Villada, who had tortured Benito García at Astorga, Fray Fernando de Santo Domingo, who had conducted the examinations at Segovia, and the Licenciado Juan Lopez de Cigales.[3]

It was not until December 17, 1490, that enough incriminating confessions had been extracted from the accused to

[1] Boletin, IX. 461–3; XI. 57–9.
[2] Rodrigo, Historia Verdadera de la Inquisición, II. 309.—Boletin, XI. 91.
[3] Boletin, XI. 8.

warrant the commencement of formal proceedings. On that day Alonso de Guevara, the promotor-fiscal, or prosecuting officer, presented his "denunciation" or indictment, which simply charged a conspiracy to procure a consecrated host, with which, and the heart of a child, a magic conjuration was to be wrought, causing the madness and death of all Christians, the destruction of the Christian religion, and the final triumph of judaism.[1] Curiously enough, up to this time the crucifixion of the victim and the insults offered to Christ, which ultimately formed so prominent a part of the story, seem not to have been thought of. It is true that Jucé Franco, in his reply to the fictitious Rabbi Abraham, had assumed this to be the accusation against him; but in the inquisitorial process, prisoners, in the preliminary examinations, were not informed of the charges against them, but were allowed to conjecture and flounder in their replies to general questions, in the hope that they might unwarily make admissions which could be used against them and their accomplices. It was not until the close of the trial, after all the resources of delay and torture had been exhausted in extracting from the accused constantly increasing incriminations of themselves and of their comrades, that, on October 21, 1491, the promotor-fiscal asked permission to make to his denunciation an addition which charged the crucifixion of the child, with the blasphemies addressed to Christ.[2]

It is not worth while to follow the prolonged trial step by step. Suffice it to say that Jucé Franco, who at first indignantly declared that the denunciation *era la mayor falsedad del mundo*, and denied its every detail,[3] as the months dragged wearily on, and as he was brought time after time from his cell before the inquisitors, made one admission after another, until, at the morning session of July 19, 1491, he confessed that, some three years before, he, with the rest of the accused,

[1] Boletin, XI. 13. [2] Ib. XI. 25. [3] Ib. XI. 14.

had been in a cave near La Guardia, where Alonso Franco showed them a child's heart recently severed from the body, and a consecrated host; these were in a small wooden box, which Juçá Tazarte took to a corner of the cave and performed certain conjurations, which he assured them would protect them from the inquisitors, for any inquisitor who should injure them would become mad within a year. That about a year later they assembled again, when a consecrated wafer was produced, and Benito García was sent with it and a letter to Mosé Abenamías at Zamora, when he was arrested at Astorga. This was quite sufficient to condemn himself and the rest to the stake, and he probably thought that it would satisfy his judges; but it did not. What means were taken to refresh his memory the record does not inform us, but in the afternoon of the same day he was again before the tribunal, when he remembered that the child was brought living to the cave, that it was crucified in the most cruel mockery of the Passion, its blood collected in vessels, and its heart ripped out by García Franco. It was at a subsequent assemblage that the heart and host were produced and the conjuration performed.[1] In all this there is no mention of torture. It is impossible to tell whether it was employed or not, although there is every appearance of its use in the interval between the two confessions, and there is no reason why it should not have been applied if needed, as it had been at the first in the case of Benito García. But it may not have been needed. The infernal patience of the Inquisition knew how to reach its ends, not only by torture, but by the wearing delays of the dungeon, by hints or assertions as to what accomplices had revealed, by promises of mercy which were never intended to be fulfilled.

Thus Jucé Franco, after a year's incarceration, was convicted out of his own mouth; but his judges were not yet ready for his condemnation. They had eight accomplices

1 Boletin, XI. 40–44.

on their hands, and if the charges were true the confessions of all of them ought to correspond, which they did not in many important details. Besides, what was the most embarrassing point of all, there was no *corpus delicti* beyond the wafer said to have been found in Benito García's knapsack. If a child had been crucified, a child must have been lost; if buried by Juan Franco, as shown by the testimony, its body ought to be found and produced. Vainly the puzzled inquisitors sought to repair these fatal breaks in the chain of evidence. No parent could be found clamoring for his murdered offspring. Juan de Ocaña, in his confession, said he had been told that it was the son of Alonso Martín, of Quintanar; but no Alonso Martín could be brought forward to prove the loss. Juan Franco, who swore that he buried the child, was carried to La Guardia to point out the grave; he did so, and the officials reported that the spot had evidently been disturbed; it was plain that there had been a hole dug, but when it was opened no remains of the martyr were discovered. Even the heart, which the mass of testimony showed that Benito García carried with the host, was not found in his knapsack by those who seized the wafer.[1] Equally fruitless were the efforts of the inquisitors to bring all the evidence into accord. During the last week of September, 1491, all the prisoners were tortured, but even this failed to produce uniformity. Then the baffled inquisitors had recourse to the very unusual expedient of confrontation —a measure never resorted to when it could be avoided. The accused were assembled in groups of three and were made to go over their stories. The report says that they tallied, but this may well be doubted, for the conclusions reached in one group do not accord with those of another. Jucé Franco, in his final defence, calls attention to the discrepancies between the statements of some of them and their agreement with him during the confrontation. Possibly on

[1] Boletin, XI. 64, 68, 112, 114, 115.—Martínez Moreno, p. 132.

this account, as a supreme effort, on November 2, torture was again administered, and the prisoners were required to answer a series of fifteen interrogatories, carefully prepared to clear up doubtful and conflicting points, and after this, on the eve of rendering sentence, five of them were again confronted.[1]

From the whole mass of testimony, in fact, it is impossible to construct a connected and coherent story. Even the crucial question of date is undetermined. This would seem to be fixed at Easter, 1488, by Jucé Franco's statement, in his confession of July 19, 1491, that the crime had been perpetrated about three years before, but on April 10 he had said that four years before he had been asked to join in some conjurations, and had declined because he was going to Murcia, and then, two years later, came the second invitation which led to the crucifixion, which would place it in 1489. Then Juan Gomes, sacristan of the church of La Guardia, who confessed to giving the consecrated host to Benito García, said that this occurred about five months previous to the arrest of the Francos, which would give the date of February, 1490. Moreover, Jucé Franco stated that the mission of Benito García to Zamora, during which he was arrested, in June, 1490, took place about a year after the crucifixion, giving for the latter again the date of Easter, 1489; but when he was confronted with Benito and Juan de Ocaña they agreed in reducing the interval to six months, making it December, 1490.[2] This mission of Benito, it may be observed, assumes a very problematic air when we consider that in place of carrying his dangerous burden direct to Zamora he took it past that place on the long pilgrimage to Compostella, and that it was during his return that it caused his detection at Astorga.

Similar contradictions are observable in the details. Jucé

[1] Boletin, XI. 53–6, 67, 68, 73, 79 *sqq.*, 94.
[2] Ib. XI. 40, 41, 45, 51, 67, 68, 111.

Franco swears that García Franco cut out the victim's heart; Juan Franco confesses that he did it himself.[1] As a rule we hear of only one heart and one consecrated host, but Jucé Franco in his final torture speaks of two hosts, one procured from the church of Romeval and one from that of La Guardia, and in the sentence of Benito García it is asserted that there were not only two hosts, but also two hearts, thus implying two crucifixions.[2] The official Relation of the Three Secretaries of the Inquisition, drawn up in 1569, attributes the origin of the affair to the presence, as spectators at an *auto de fé* in Toledo, of one of the Jews implicated and one of the *conversos*, when the *converso* expressed his dread of the ruin impending over them from the Inquisition, and the Jew told him that if they could get the heart of a Christian boy it might all be averted.[3] But Juan Franco, in his confession under his final torture, stated that the first effort to neutralize the Inquisition was simply with a consecrated host. This was found to be ineffective when Alonso Franco was penanced at an *auto* in Toledo, and the brothers Franco then applied to Juçá Tazarte for a stronger conjuration, and he told them to get a Christian child.[4]

The same uncertainty prevails as to the identification of the victim and the manner of his procurement. Jucé Franco swore that the child was brought to the cave by Juan Franco, who, when asked whence it came, replied that it was caught where it never would be inquired after.[5] Juan de Ocaña swore that Mosé Franco, the deceased brother of Jucé, brought it from Quintanar to Tembleque, and said that it was the son of Alonso Martín; that from Tembleque it was conveyed to the cave on an ass by Mosé and Jucé and Don

[1] Boletin, XI. 44, 52.

[2] Ib. XI. 80, 87, 115 *sqq.*

[3] Martínez Moreno, p. 122. Padre Fita, with his customary diligence, has endeavored to identify this Toledan *auto de fé* from a manuscript account of those celebrated in that city from 1485 to 1501, and thinks it must be that of May 7, 1487, or of July 25, 1488 (Boletin, t. XI. Oct. 1887, pp. 290, 303, 305).

[4] Boletin, XI. 83.

[5] Ib. XI. 50.

Ça their father, and David de Perejón, Juçá Tazarte, and Juan Franco.[1] Jucé Franco, however, in his final torture, November 2, adhered to the assertion that Juan Franco brought it to the cave, and added details as to its being caught in the streets of Toledo.[2] Finally, Juan Franco, in the confrontation of November 14, stated that he brought the boy from Toledo, and Benito García confirmed this, saying that they were together on this errand when Juan picked him up at the *puerta del Perdon* of the cathedral.[3] This became the official story, although the Inquisition admitted its inability to identify the victim by merely styling him in the final sentence *un niño cristiano*. How it came subsequently in the Relation of the Three Secretaries to know that the child's name was Juan, son of Alonso de Pasamontes and of Juana de la Guindera, it never took the trouble to explain.[4] Nor does Damián de Vegas, who in 1544 wrote the earliest account of the affair, printed by Padre Fita, give us his authority for saying that the child's name was Cristóbal, and that he was the son of a woman born blind.[5]

In thus reviewing the evidence it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that the Santo Niño was a mere creature of the imagination, begotten by torture and despair. Possibly some *conversos* may have sought to procure by means of sorcery immunity from the threatening dangers of the Inquisition, for it is not easy to set bounds to the superstitious credulity of the period, but it is extremely improbable, as Jucé Franco pointed out in his defence, that Jews, who were not subject to inquisitorial jurisdiction, would have dabbled in such dangerous practices to shield *conversos* with whom they had no sympathy,[6] even though it was alleged that for the success of the conjuration it was necessary that five Jews and

[1] Boletin, XI. 64. [2] Ib. XI. 82. [3] Ib. XI. 95.
[4] Martínez Moreno, p. 125.—Boletin, XI. 103.
[5] Historia del Niño inocente de la Guardia (Boletin, XI. 135, 139).
[6] Boletin, XI. 75.

five Christians should take part,[1] the fact being that the number of *conversos* was six.[2] Everything points to the probability that when Benito García, in returning from his pilgrimage to Compostella, fell under suspicion, he was forced by intolerable torture to invent some story that should satisfy his pitiless examiner, and to name his presumed accomplices. When they were all arrested it was simply a question of endurance how long they should baffle the judges determined to wring from them confirmation of Benito's statements. It speaks well for their courage that some of them resisted so long, but in their vague endeavors to save themselves suffering by constructing a relation that should conform to that of their accuser, they blundered inevitably, and added new details. It required sixteen months of patient work, repeated torturings, and two successive confrontations to mould the whole into an approach to a coherent story, and even then the contradictions and inconsistencies were still apparent. It matters little that, when the sentence was read at the *auto de fé*, and again when Jucé Franco was bound to the stake, he is reported as ratifying and confirming his confession.[3] Even granting that the official record is trustworthy, similar persistence occurred too frequently in witchcraft trials, when the most impossible absurdities were involved, for us to doubt that prolonged imprisonment and repeated torture induced a frame of mind in which the victim would blindly and hopelessly persist to the end in what he had been forced to confess.

The inquisitors had long had ample material in the confessions to justify condemnation, and at length they abandoned the thankless task of reconciling all discrepancies. On November 16, 1491, they held a solemn *auto*, in which were read the sentences of condemnation, framed so as to excite the liveliest popular horror, and to bring into especial promi-

[1] Boletin, XI. 89, 91. [2] Ib. XI. 42. [3] Ib. XI. 106, 108.

nence the proselyting efforts of the Jews and the judaizing propensities of the *conversos*. The victims were "relaxed" to the secular arm. At the *Brasero de la Dehesa*—which long remained as the inquisitorial *quemadero*, or burning place—Jucé Franco and his aged father were torn with hot pincers and burnt to death. The three deceased Jews were burnt in effigy. The *conversos* had a milder fate. By professing repentance and begging re-incorporation in the bosom of the church they obtained the privilege of being strangled before burning.[1]

There are not wanting signs that popular conviction as to the guilt of the victims was not quite as unanimous as the inquisitors desired. The day after the execution, Antón Gonzalez, the notary, by order of the Inquisition, sent to La Guardia a copy of the sentence of Benito García, with instructions that, under pain of excommunication, it should be read from the pulpit on a feast day, and that general notice should be given in order that everybody may keep his mouth shut, *porque el asno está enalbardado*—a proverbial phrase which Padre Fita tells us is equivalent to the popular warning, "*Con el rey y la inquisición, chitón*"—"With the king and the Inquisition, silence!" Gonzalez significantly adds, "I say this, señores, on account of the gossip of this honorable town."[2] If, however, there were godless doubters in Ávila, the pious populace was not troubled with such scruples, and it hailed the affair as an opportunity of gratifying the hatred of the Jews and the love of rapine which had so often elsewhere been justified by similar occurrences. The first serious manifestation of this was the stoning to death of an unlucky Hebrew, while menaces of massacre and pillage came thickly. The frightened Aljama appealed to the sovereigns, who, from Córdoba, December 16, issued to the magistrates of Ávila letters taking the Jews under the royal

[1] Boletin, XI. 107, 108, 113.

[2] Ib. XI. 114.

safeguard and ordering the severe punishment of all who should maltreat them.[1]

Torquemada undoubtedly exploited the affair to the utmost. The sentence of Benito García, in which the dangers of intercourse between Jews and *conversos* was prominently emphasized, was translated into Catalan and sent to the Inquisition of Barcelona.[2] It is safe to conclude from this, and from the similar action at La Guardia, that it was generally distributed and was read from the pulpits of all the prominent churches of Spain. That Torquemada used the case effectively with Ferdinand and Isabella, to procure the edict of expulsion, there can be little reasonable doubt. It was generally so thought at the time, and Padre Fita has sufficiently met the objections of Señor José Amador de los Rios.[3] In the edict there is, naturally enough, no direct allusion to the Niño, or to the crucifixion of children; but the reasons for the expulsion are stated at great length to be the proselyting efforts of the Jews and the resultant contamination of the *conversos*. The stress laid upon this throughout the proceedings of the trial and in the sentences of the victims shows how the efforts of the inquisitors were directed to producing this impression. In fact, it is hardly possible to compare the expressions of the edict with the confessions extorted during the trial without feeling convinced that the latter were fresh in the mind of the draughtsman of the former.[4]

There would seem to be even stronger evidence in the fact that during the conquest of Granada the capitulations granted to the cities which surrendered guaranteed to the Jewish inhabitants the same privileges accorded to the *Mudejares*—the Moors who enjoyed free exercise of their religion and civil rights under the Christian sovereigns. In a general formula, adopted at the surrender of Almería, December 22,

[1] Boletin, XI. 420 (Nov. 1887). [2] Ib. XI. 122.

[3] Ib. XI. 131, 421.—Historia de los Judíos de España, III. 318.

[4] Compare the edict (Amador de los Rios, III. 604) with the passages in Boletin, XI. 36, 49, 60, 86, 102, 116.

1490, even renegade Christians were not claimed for the Inquisition, but were allowed a year in which to expatriate themselves; and though this was shortened to a month in the terms granted at the final surrender of Granada, November 25, 1491, the native Jews were still confirmed in all their rights of residence and religion.[1] It was but four months afterwards that the edict of expulsion was issued, March 31, 1492, showing that during the interval some new and overwhelming impulse must have been brought to bear upon the sovereigns.

As a question of historical importance, the case of the Santo Niño might here be closed, but the sequel sheds too much light on the spirit which governed Spain during the succeeding centuries to be dismissed without brief consideration. Throughout the ages in which men were constantly and eagerly seeking for objects of veneration and for intercessors between them and God, there was a strong impulsion to regard as martyrs and saints the victims of the sanguinary ferocity ascribed to the Jews. A well-known case is that of Hugh of Lincoln, the child crucified by the Jews in 1255, still known as St. Hugh in the hagiology of England, with his feast on August 27.[2] How utterly unreasoning was this tendency, and how eagerly it was exploited, is seen in an incident during the terrible massacres of 1190. At Stamford many Jews were slain and great booty was obtained. A crusader named John, who had taken an active part in the pillage, carried his spoils to Hampton and deposited a portion with a person who, through covetousness, slew him and cast his body outside of the town. The murderer fled when the corpse was recognized, but the belief spread rapidly that John was a martyr; miracles were worked at his grave and

[1] Francisco Fernandez y Gonzalez, Estado Social y Político de los Mudejares de Castilla, Madrid, 1866, pp. 420, 428.

[2] Stanton's Menology of England and Wales, London, 1887, p. 415.

pilgrims flocked thither well laden with offerings, to the great satisfaction of the presiding priests, until the bishop came, and, after examining into the affair, put a stop to the absurd cult.[1] Even more instructive is a case related by the zealous Dominican John Nider as occurring about 1430. A boy of thirteen, attending school at Ravenspurg, near Constance, disappeared. After long search his body was found in a pine tree within a league of the town. It bore no marks of violence, but the people concluded that he had been martyred by the Jews, such apparently being the natural belief in the absence of other explanation. Miracles at once commenced; a wooden chapel was built for the new saint and offerings in abundance were received by the custodians. Yet there were doubters; and when soon afterwards the Emperor Sigismund chanced to pass that way he investigated the matter and found that it was all deception. The chapel had not yet been consecrated; he ordered it to be torn down and forbade the worship of the pseudo-saint, which at once collapsed.[2] Greater success attended the devotion bestowed on a boy named Werner, whose corpse was found, in 1287, in a wood near Wesel, and whose death, attributed to the Jews, led to a general massacre. The body was brought to Bacharach, where a handsome chapel was erected over it and many miracles were wrought, till at length, in 1421, the martyr was canonized as St. Werner by Cardinal Branda, the legate sent by Martin V. to preach the crusade against the Hussites.[3] Similar was the result in the case of the boy Simeon, slain by the Jews at Trent in 1472. He immediately coruscated in miracles and was worshipped as a saint. In 1475 Sixtus IV. forbade this until the matter should be regularly investigated by the Holy See, but the result of the examination was favorable and the worship was resumed.[4]

[1] Guill. de Noviburgo, Hist. Angl. lib. IV. c. viii.

[2] Jo. Nider Formicar. lib. III. c. xi.

[3] Gest. Treviror. Archiepp. ann. 1287.—Cornel. Zanfliet Chron. ann. 1421.

[4] Benedicti PP. XIV. de Servorum Dei Beatificatione lib. I. cap. xiv. No. 4.

In the case of the Niño, no time was lost in adding to the *éclat* of the affair by stimulating popular veneration. In his letter to La Guardia, written the day after the executions, Antón Gonzalez expresses the hope that God will miraculously make manifest the bones of the martyr, and he begs the magistrates not to allow the spot pointed out by Juan Franco as the place of burial to be ploughed over, for it is a place for Ferdinand and Isabella, for the cardinal (Archbishop Pedro Gonzalez de Mendoza), and for the whole world to gaze upon. Rather should there be a monument built there in memory of the *sagrada pasión* of the martyr. The impulse did not require much urging, and before the year 1492 had passed four miracles are recorded as having already been wrought there.[1]

The legend grew with customary rapidity. The earliest connected history of the affair is by the licentiate Damián de Vegas, who, in 1544, collected at La Guardia all current information bearing upon it, so that his narrative represents the recollection of contemporaries. Already so confused were these recollections that the culprits were said to be Jews who had gone to France after the edict of expulsion in 1492, had there conspired to destroy Christianity by the methods described in the story told by Alonso de Espina, and, being consequently banished, had returned to Spain, where they were known as Francos from their sojourn in France. The Niño's name, as I have already mentioned, was Cristóbal, a boy six or eight years old, whom Juan Franco stole from his blind mother and kept for several months, the neighbors believing him to be a son by a former wife. At the crucifixion a regular passion-play was performed, reproducing that of Christ in all its details. Already there appears in it another actor, Hernando de Rivera, the accountant of the prior of San Juan, who

[1] Boletin, XI. 113–4. One of the suggestive contradictions in the affair is that, only the day before this letter was written by order of the inquisitors, they had distinctly declared in the sentence of Benito García that the place of burial of the Niño was unknown (ibid. p. 119).

represented Pilate, but who succeeded in postponing his punishment until the death of the prior, when he was burnt in Toledo, thirty years afterwards.[1]

As part of this performance the Niño was made to drag his cross around the mountain, amid rocks and forests, a task which a strong man could not have accomplished without resting twice or thrice. To force him to do this the Jews administered to him 6200 stripes. They had intended inflicting only the same number as those of Christ, but by an error in computation they made it 1000 more.[2] In the fully developed later legend all this is related in great detail, with every incident, from the Garden of Gethsemane to Calvary, with the actors in all the parts—Judas, Annas, Caiaphas, Pilate, Herod, etc. In his course around the mountain the Niño was obliged to rest three times, and at each of these spots a chapel was erected by the piety of the people of La Guardia. In the matter of the stripes there is a noticeable falling-off, for the tormentors only gave him 5500, being five more than the 5495 received by Christ, according to Ludolf of Saxony, the Carthusian. This error they discovered through the Niño, who had endured the 5495 in silence,

[1] Damián de Vegas, Historia del Niño inocente de la Guardia (Boletin, XI. 135–9, 146–7). Hernando de Rivera was burnt in Toledo in 1521. His sentence, which is printed by Martínez Moreno (p. 163), recites that he was a judaizer, that he denied the future life, that he acted Pilate in the crucifixion of the Niño, and that he endeavored by sorcery, with the bone of a Christian, a consecrated host, and some ashes, to procure safety from the Inquisition and an accountantship which he was desirous of obtaining. Padre Fita informs us (Boletin, XI. 149) that this document was purposely interpolated, and it is observable that the allusion to the Niño occurs only in the recital of the accusation; it is absent in the summary of confession, and in the final declaration of the judaizing heresies proved against him. He evidently was burned as a Jew simply and not as an accomplice in the tragedy. Padre Fita has reprinted the sentence with learned annotations (Boletin, XIV. 97).

The uncertainty as to the victim is illustrated by Vegas's statement that he was six or eight years old, when Jucé Franco had described him as three or four (Boletin, XI. 42).

[2] Boletin, XI. 141.

crying during the last five, and, on being asked the reason, he replied, "Because you have given me five more than to my Divine Lord." He manifested equal presence of mind when Benito García opened his right side and vainly groped after his heart. "What are you looking for, Jew?" he said; "if for my heart, you will find it on the other side," and Benito followed his advice. It is no wonder, as Martínez Moreno tells us, that the whole earth trembled, and that the sun rejoiced that it was under the earth and could not witness the dreadful spectacle.[1]

His miracles commenced with his death. At the moment he expired, his mother, who was congenitally blind, received her sight. Search was made for her in Toledo; she was found and told the day of his disappearance, and also the time of the unsealing of her eyes, which was found to correspond with that of his last breath—though we have seen that the latter could never be determined, and Damián de Vegas increases the confusion by assigning it to the latter part of March, 1492.[2]

It mattered little to the worshippers of the Niño that no relic of him rewarded their search. Vegas tells us in 1544 that not a single bone, not even the breeches and shoes in which he had been buried, were found in the grave. What added to this *cosa misteriosa* was that not even the heart was met with in Benito García's knapsack; there was the cloth in which it had been wrapped, but the heart was gone, and even the blood-stains on the cloth had disappeared. The good licentiate can only suggest that God took him in the flesh to the joys of paradise.[3] This happy solution of the mystery became the accepted faith. Martínez Moreno, who was parish priest of La Guardia, writing in 1785, tells us

[1] Martínez Moreno, pp. 55–6, 65, 68.

[2] Damián de Vegas (Boletin, XI. 140, 145). Moreno (p. 69) corrects the date to Friday, March 31, 1491, but in that year March 31 happened to be Holy Thursday, and not Good Friday.

[3] Boletin, XI. 145.

that it was universally believed that God had completed the parallel between Christ and the Niño, and on the third day had carried the body to heaven. The reason why no relics —neither cross, nor crown, nor nails, nor anything else— had been preserved was doubtless to save the faithful from idolatry, as they might have been confounded with those of Christ.[1]

Yet one material relic of the occurrence was preserved. Damián de Vegas shows us by his account of its discovery how soon the real history of the affair was forgotten. He tells us that Benito García was sent to a learned Jew in Ávila to perform the conjuration, the heart being securely concealed in his knapsack, and the host hidden between the leaves of a book of hours. On his arrival, after securing quarters at an inn, Benito, to maintain an exterior of sanctity, went to a church, where he knelt and prayed, beating his breast with signs of great devotion. A worshipper kneeling behind him observed with much admiration streams of colored splendor shooting forth from the prayer-book, and imagining its owner to be a saint, followed him to his inn, and then hastened to the Inquisition to report the miracle. The inquisitors recognized that it was something to be inquired into; they proceeded to the inn, and after a short examination Benito broke down and revealed the whole plot without torture.[2] Subsequent writers tell us that the miraculous host was carried in solemn procession to the church of Torquemada's convent of San Tomás, where it was still shown, divinely preserved from corruption, three centuries later, in the time of Martínez Moreno, and is probably still exhibited to the present day.[3] It wrought many miracles, chief among which was the rescue of Ávila, in 1520, from a pest which ravaged Spain for two or three years, but which it cut short in six months.[4]

[1] Martínez Moreno, pp. 94, 96.

[2] Damián de Vegas (Boletin, XI. 143). [3] Martínez Moreno, pp. 83, 117.

[4] Boletin, XI. 154. Padre Fita tells us that Margaret, daughter of Maxi-

The cult of the Niño began early. The people tore down the house of Juan Franco, and as the Niño's martyrdom was considered to have begun there during the time when Juan was said to have kept him as his son, it was converted into a church, which Moreno describes as having three altars. In a visitation of the church of La Guardia, made March 29, 1501, it is alluded to as *los Palacios del Inocente*, but in the next visitation, made eight years later, it is called *del santo Inocente*, showing the growth of the cult in the interval. The cave in which he suffered was transformed into a great church, and at the mouth was built a convent of Trinitarian fathers, subsequently transferred to the town. A chapel was erected at the grave, and others at the spots where he sank under the cross. No sooner were the altars dedicated to him than he brought great benefits to the town, and it chose him for its patron saint. In 1613 the chapter of Toledo applied to Rome to approve an office of the Santo Inocente, and to authorize its use in the archbishopric, if not throughout Europe, stating that his cult was daily increasing with corresponding miracles; but the Holy See appears never to have formally admitted his claims, though it is said to have permitted indulgences, plenary and partial, to be granted to those visiting his churches and altars, he being styled *Santo* in the briefs.[1] Benedict XIV., in his exhaustive treatise on beatification and canonization, says there is no instance of the canonization by the Holy See of a child martyred by the Jews, and among the cases which he discusses he does not even allude to the Santo Niño, showing that the affair had

milian I. and widow of Prince Juan (she died in 1530), caused the casket containing the host to be covered with silver (ib. p. 155). The miracle of 1520 was commemorated in a long and detailed document, printed by Padre Fita (ib. p. 153), but the silence concerning it of Damián de Vegas in 1544 casts some doubt on its authenticity.

It is not a little singular that Oviedo, writing in 1555, and alluding to the murder of children by Jews, makes no mention of the case of the Santo Niño (Quinquagenas, Madrid, 1880, I. 280).

[1] Martínez Moreno, pp. 101–106.

attracted no attention in Rome.[1] Notwithstanding this his devotees asserted him to be the most powerful advocate and protector of the Spanish monarchy, and Francisco de Quevedo, in a memorial to Philip IV., ascribed this to his being both body and soul in heaven.[2]

The lasting impression made by the affair is shown by the place it occupies in Spanish literature. It was effectively used to keep up a healthy feeling of antagonism to judaism.[3] It was twice dramatized—by Lope de Vega and José Cañizares—and a Latin poem was written on it in 1592 by Jerónimo Ramirez. The first continuous narrative printed was that of Fray Rodrigo de Yepes, in 1583. There have been numerous others—by Sebastian de Nieva Calvo in 1628, by P. Antonio de Guzman in 1720, by Martín Martínez Moreno in 1785, and by Paulino Herrero in 1853, while the reprint of Moreno's book in 1866, and a work by Felipe García in 1883, show that interest in the subject has been maintained till our own times.[4]

[1] Benedicti PP. XIV. de Servorum Dei Beatificatione lib. I. c. xiv. No. 5; lib. III. c. xv. No. 2–7. The cult of the Santo Niño would appear to be in derogation of the bull *Cœlestis*, issued in 1634 by Urban VIII. to check the prevailing abuse of worshipping as saints and martyrs those who have not been so pronounced by the Holy See, of relating their miracles in books, and representing them with the nimbus of sanctity. Delinquents are required to forfeit all such books, pictures, and images, and are to be punished by ordinaries and inquisitors with pecuniary and corporal penalties proportionate to the offence (Magnum Bullar. Roman. T. IV. p. 85; Append. p. 33). In obedience to this the Spanish Inquisition suppressed all images and portraits adorned with the symbols of sanctity the originals of which had not been canonized or beatified in Rome (Index Libror. Prohib., Madrid, 1640, regula xvi.; Índice Último, Madrid, 1790, p. xxvi), but this rule does not seem to have been observed with regard to the Santo Niño.

[2] Martínez Moreno, pp. 10, 16, 109.

[3] Torrejoncillos, Centinela contra Judíos, ed. 1731, pp. 151–55.

[4] Fidel Fita, Boletin, XI. 112, 156.

BRIANDA DE BARDAXÍ.[1]

THE name of Brianda de Bardaxí is unknown to history. She was only one of the multitude of obscure sufferers whose wrongs and agonies were a matter of course in the evil days in which she lived, and are forgotten save in the records of the dread tribunal which sat in judgment on them. Her story is a commonplace one, and precisely on that account it possesses interest as an illustration of the methods by which the Spanish Inquisition secured the supreme blessing of uniformity of faith, and aided in reducing to impotence a people who, under Charles V. and Philip II., seemed destined to universal monarchy.

To render it intelligible, I must repeat that the motive for establishing the Inquisition in Spain was the judaizing tendency popularly ascribed to the *conversos*, or converts from judaism, and their immediate descendants. The general massacres of 1391, the partial ones which followed, and the cruelly repressive laws of the fifteenth century had compelled or induced vast numbers of Jews to submit to baptism. The sincerity of conversions effected after this fashion might well be doubted, and the impression was general that a large proportion, if not all, the *conversos* were secretly inclined to their old faith. Rabbinical judaism had so completely surrounded the believer with observances, which through generations had become part of his daily existence, that it was

[1] Reprinted by permission from the *Atlantic Monthly* of February, 1889.

impossible for them to be abruptly cast aside. As the zeal of fanaticism grew intense, everything which savored of Jewish custom was regarded as proof of heresy and apostasy, and the inquisitor sought not so much to ascertain directly the belief of those accused as to find whether they were guilty of following any of the abhorred customs. This led to a minuteness of definition of criminal acts unparalleled in the history of jurisprudence. In the sentences which condemned to the stake, to confiscation, or to penances which were punishments of the severest description, we find enumerated such offences as avoiding the use of fat, and especially of lard, eating *amin*, a kind of broth esteemed by Jews, eating Passover bread, reading and even possessing a Hebrew Bible, ignorance of the Paternoster and Creed, saying that a good Jew could be saved, blessing a child and passing the hands over his face, resting on Saturdays and working on Sundays, neglecting to make the sign of the cross and to kneel at the elevation of the host, eating raw eggs on the day a brother died, eating often with a father who had remained a Jew, giving alms to Jews, casting small pieces of dough into the fire while employed in kneading it, putting on a clean tablecloth on Friday afternoon, changing the body linen on Saturday. In one case, the only crime asserted in the sentence of a woman was that she had been present at the wedding of a Jew, her brother. In another it was alleged against the penitent that when very sick his sister told him to commend himself to the God of Abraham, and he had returned no answer. In another, it was gravely averred that the offender, when dealing with Old Christians, tried to cheat them, and rejoiced when he succeeded. Eating meat in Lent, even casually, was of course a symptom of the gravest character, and equally so was abstaining from food on the Jewish fasts of Kippur or of Queen Esther.[1] In this hypersensitiveness

[1] These offences are all alleged in the abstracts of sentences contained in a MS. in my possession, entitled *Memoria de diversos Autos de Inquisicion celebrados en Çaragoça desde el año de 1484 asta el de 1502.*

of orthodoxy, it was of course easy to find grounds of suspicion against all who were newly born to the Church, and to be suspected, as we shall see, was in itself a crime.

Shortly after the Inquisition was established in Aragon in 1484, a woman named Brianda de Bardaxí, appeared before it.[1] Whether she had been cited, or came spontaneously in pursuance of the customary edict promising mercy to those who would present themselves within a given time and tell all they knew about themselves and others, does not appear, and is of little moment. She evidently belonged to the *conversos* of the wealthy class, of whom there were many holding high station in Church and State. She was then a woman about thirty years of age, married to Gabriel de la Cabra, who seems to have been well to do. Her mother, Salvadora Salvat, was turned of seventy, and resided at Barbastro with a widowed daughter-in-law, Aldonza Junqueras. There had been some dissension between them, the mother thinking that Brianda had obtained more than her share of the family property.

In the general terror evoked by the Inquisition, the ties of kindred amounted to little. Every one was required to reveal all he knew, whether it affected the life of parent or child, husband or wife, and the instinct of self-preservation blotted out all other instincts and affections. Moreover, as the names of accusers and hostile witnesses were kept secret, and no one was allowed to know on whose evidence he was tried and condemned, the opportunity for the gratification of malignity was unbounded. It was the time for wicked men and wicked women, as Gilabert Desplugas boasted when he threatened revenge on Brianda's husband, who had evicted him from a house for not paying rent, and he made his words

[1] The following details are drawn from the records of the trial, preserved in the Llorente MSS. now in the Bibliothèque Nationale de France (fonds espagnol, No. 80).

good. Gilabert himself was penanced in the *auto de fé* of May 21, 1486, and his wife had been burnt three months before. In that Saturnalia of persecution every one with a drop of Jewish blood in his veins walked as though on a lava crust that might engulf him at any moment.

When Brianda came before the Inquisition, she confessed nothing as to herself, but mentioned that when she was about five years old she had one day seen her mother fast until nightfall, and when she was about fifteen she had seen it repeated by her mother and sister-in-law. When about ten, at the town of Alcolea, she had heard a woman named Violante Fayol speak some Hebrew words, had seen her one day barefooted, and on asking the reason had been told that it was a Jewish fast day. This was the sum of her revelations, which appear frivolous enough; but it was in a strange, distempered world, seeming to us now like a hideous nightmare peopled with fantastic spectres whose actions defy human reason. The information was sufficient for the Inquisition: doubtless Violante Fayol was duly looked after, though we know nothing of her fate, but we do know that the mother and sister-in-law were brought to account, and they could readily guess the source of the accusation against them.

Several years passed away, for the terrible patience of the Inquisition, secure of its victim, alive or dead, was accustomed to wait till it had exhausted its indirect means of obtaining information before casting the net which should envelop the accused. Salvadora and Aldonza were at length arrested and put on trial. The old woman, angry with her daughter and frightened by threats of torture, endeavored to satisfy her judges by sacrificing her child, and, as she afterwards admitted, between fear and hatred, she told more than the truth. She accused Brianda of having participated knowingly in the forbidden fasts on both occasions, and when she and Aldonza were condemned to penance she had at least the satisfaction of gratified revenge.

The evidence was transmitted to Saragossa, where the Inquisition had been gathering further testimony against the incriminated Brianda; for depositions dated in 1485 and 1486 show that she had not been lost sight of. At length, on February 9, 1488, the prosecutor brought his charges against her, supported by such evidence as had been procured. It was trivial and flimsy, much of it based on hearsay gossip, for in the jurisprudence of the time there was no limit set as to the quality of evidence. The most important was the testimony of Gilabert Desplugas and his two daughters that Brianda had admitted to them that she secretly led the life of a Jew; and besides this, a certain Maria Guillem deposed that she had said of the murdered inquisitor, Pedro Arbués, commonly called Master Epila, that his only fault was that he purchased testimony. On the same day Brianda was subjected to an interrogatory, and again on May 19. Then a long interval followed, and she was examined a third time on February 17, 1491. Promises of mercy and threats of rigor were not spared, but only a few trifling matters could be extracted from her in addition to her original confession. She remembered that when five or six years old she had eaten one or two mouthfuls of Passover bread, given to her by a neighbor whose name she had forgotten, and that, some eighteen years before, in the house of Gilabert Desplugas, she had refused to eat some *amin* because she disliked it, when she and Maria Desplugas came to blows over the matter.[1]

Meanwhile, she had been allowed to employ as counsel a certain Pedro de Bordalva, selected, as usual, by the Inquisition. On July 1, 1490, he put in his argument for the defence, in which he smartly and vigorously exposed the nugatory character of the evidence for the prosecution. He

[1] This Maria Desplugas was penanced in the *auto de fé* of March 2, 1488, but was spared confiscation because she had voluntarily come forward and informed on herself and others, including the Bardaxí family.

also gave a list of forty witnesses whom he desired the inquisitors to examine—for in these proceedings all evidence was taken secretly by the judges themselves, and counsel were not allowed to participate. This evidence developed the animosity of the mother and sister-in-law, and the enmity of Gilabert Desplugas and his family. Abundant witnesses swore that Brianda was an earnestly religious woman, leading the life of a nun rather than that of the world; she wore a hair shirt next to the skin, and walked barefoot in the processions; she observed rigorously all the fasts commanded or recommended by the Church; she spent an hour or two a day in prayer, and ate freely of both fat and lard. When the holy Pedro Arbués was slain, and his dried blood on the church pavement suddenly liquefied and welled forth, she sent a serving-man to dip a linen cloth in it, which she kissed and made her household kiss, as the blood of a martyr. Moreover, there were put in evidence an application from her to the pope for the privilege of choosing a confessor, indulgences granted to her by the Master of the Order for the Redemption of Captives, a papal absolution to her for certain vows, a bull *de la Cruzada* in her favor, and an absolution *a culpa et pœna* given to her, showing that she had liberally spent money for the salvation of her soul according to the most orthodox observances.

The only testimony obtainable in rebuttal was a re-examination of the old witnesses, who simply repeated what they had said before. Thus the evidence in her favor preponderated, and conviction was not easy without a further confession. In such a dilemma the only resource for a puzzled inquisitor was torture. After a considerable interval, on March 8, 1492, she was therefore brought before the tribunal and solemnly adjured to tell the truth, in default of which she would be tortured. She bravely replied that she was innocent and was ready to endure any torture, but protested that if she should, while under it, confess anything, it would

be through fear, and not through truth, and she denied it in advance.

She was forthwith taken to the torture-chamber, and bound on the trestle for the water torture, which I have described in the preceding essay. For an hour and a half she was subjected to this torment, and the colorless official record, which I transcribe literally, gives us a clear insight into the methods which, with rare exceptions, broke down the firmness of the most resolute.

At the first interval she was told to confess all the Jewish rites which she had observed, to which she replied that she was innocent. The torture was resumed, and then she was thrice summoned to tell what Jewish ceremonies she had performed. She asked the inquisitors to enumerate the ceremonies, when she said she had performed them all, but could give no details. She was evidently weakening, and the water was resumed for a while, after which she promised she would tell the truth. On being asked again what ceremonies she had performed, she replied that she admitted those named in the proceedings. Then she said she had kept the Kippur fast with Salvadora and Aldonza, who told her she would become rich if she would do so; she was then fifteen or sixteen years old. When asked if she had done so more than once, she did not remember. Asked if what she said was true, she replied yes. Asked if, when she fasted, she believed in the law of Moses, she said that Salvadora and Aldonza told her to believe in it, and she did so. Asked, since she believed in the law of Moses, what other Jewish ceremonies she had performed, she said she had given alms to Jews. Asked what Jews, she said that seven or eight years before, after her marriage, she had in her house given four sous to a Jew named Pastor for a poor Jew. Asked whether, when they fasted, other persons knew of it, she said no, for they shut themselves up. Adjured to tell the truth, she said she did not eat the fat of meat. Asked on what they supped

after the fasts she said on codfish, and then again on meat. Then she was pressingly asked whether she had performed other Jewish ceremonies, and she replied that she had once kept the fast of Queen Esther, during Lent, at the instigation of a Jewess named Algeroza. Asked if her husband knew of it or was in the house, she said no. Asked what women she had in the house at the time, she said a woman named ——, who was about to be married. Asked if she took the *glandolita*, or sinew, out of the leg of meat she said no. Asked to tell all the Jewish ceremonies she had performed, she said all that a Jew can perform. Asked what ceremonies, she said taking out the *glandolita* and the fat. Asked with whom she had performed the fasts and other ceremonies, she said with the wife of Domingo Agustin. Asked what fasts, she said the fasts of God, such as Lent and Advent. The torment was then resumed, after which she said that she had performed all the Jewish ceremonies that could be named. Asked if she knew of others who did so, she said no. Then the torture was recommenced, and in the next interval she said that she had kept the Kippur fast with Juana Sanchez, now dead, the wife of Maestro Pedro de la Cabra the younger. Asked how long ago, she said about eighteen years. Asked where and with whom, she said in the house of the said Juana Sanchez, with Catalina Sanchez, her sister. Asked who taught her how to observe the Kippur, she said Salvadora and Aldonza. Asked who induced the other, she or Pedro's wife, she replied that they were together when she said to Juana, Will you fast? Juana said yes, and they fasted.

All these disconnected and incoherent trivialities were but slender results from the infliction of such prolonged agony, but nothing more could be obtained. According to law, torture could be applied but once, but the tribunals were not accustomed to submit to such restriction, and easily evaded it by the fiction of adjournment and continuance. Accordingly, in the present case, when Brianda was unbound, the

inquisitor announced that the torture was not finished, and would be continued on the third day.

The inhuman criminal legislation of the period acknowledged the worthlessness of confessions under torture by considering them invalid unless they were confirmed after removal from the place of torment. On the third day, therefore, Brianda was brought into the council-chamber of the Inquisition, where, the record is careful to inform us, there was no sign of torture, and was interrogated under oath. She declared that all she had uttered on the trestle was false, and had been extorted from her by fear and agony. The question of what to do when a confession was thus retracted was one which puzzled the legists greatly, but was usually solved by the ready expedient of repeating the infliction. So it was in this case. The inquisitors thrice warned Brianda solemnly to tell the truth, as otherwise they would subject her to torture again. She defiantly answered that she had already told the truth; they might kill her if they pleased; if they tortured her a hundred times she would confess a hundred times, and would retract on removal. They were doubtless used to this display of vehemence on the part of the victim, and were unmoved. An order was promptly issued for the "continuance" of the torture; she was carried back to the place of torment, where she desired the notary to record a public protest that whatever she might say would be extorted by pain. Thus far the brave woman had borne herself resolutely, but she miscalculated the physical endurance of her over-wrought nerves and exhausted frame. She was stripped, and preparations were made to hoist her in the strappado, which was a very effective form of torture, when she fell to the floor in a swoon and became deathly cold. It was against the humane provisions of the law to endanger the life of a patient, and the baffled inquisitors had her carried out.

Thus, after proceedings which had lasted four years, exhausting all the methods of the Inquisition, no positive evi-

dence had been obtained even as to the infinitesimal offences alleged against her. Through those long years she had endured the unceasing anxieties of suspense, as well as the sharper agonies of the torture-chamber, and the awful punishment which she had thus undergone might well have been regarded as atoning for whatever problematical derelictions she might have been guilty of. Still, the faith had not yet been vindicated. Nothing, in fact, had been proved, but to inquisitorial casuists there had been cause shown for suspicion against her; and to be subject to suspicion was, in the inquisitorial code, itself a crime, requiring public abjuration and penance. When, therefore, the customary council of learned jurists was assembled to consult upon her case, they unanimously decided that she was "vehemently suspect" of judaizing heresy, and must abjure and undergo such penance as the discretion of the inquisitors might impose. The points of which she was thus held suspect are enumerated in her public abjuration in the *auto de fé* of March 28, 1492, the outcome of her four years of misery. On the scaffold in the church of Nuestra Señora de la Gracia she was made to declare herself suspected—

"That for some years, both as a child and after marriage, I observed the fast of Kippur.

"That I did not eat lard.

"That I frequented the house of the condemned heretic, Beatriz, wife of Gilabert Desplugas, for which your reverences hold me suspect that I went to judaize.

"That when the reverend father Inquisitor Epila was killed I rejoiced at what was done to him.

"That I said the only fault of the said Master Epila was that he purchased testimony.

"That I have confessed that when I was a child I ate Passover bread."

Then followed the sentence, in which the inquisitors, in the name of Christ, said: "We find that we must declare and pronounce her suspect of the crimes and heresy and

apostasy which she has abjured, and as these suspicions must not remain unpunished, we assign to her as penance that she do not commit these crimes and errors, and we condemn her to imprisonment at our discretion, reserving such other penance as we may see fit to impose, and we condemn her in the costs of the case, the taxation of which we reserve to ourselves."

A few days later there followed the imposition of the penance thus reserved: Brianda was to be shut up for five years in the tower of Saliana, she was to confess and receive the sacrament thrice a year, and she was to forfeit to the Inquisition one-third of all her property, which was to discharge her from the obligation of paying the costs—except, presumably, the fees of her counsel, Pedro de Bordalvo, which were taxed at fourteen florins. The said third of her property, or its money value, was to be paid within ten days, under penalty of a mulct of two thousand gold florins, and of being convicted of all the crimes and heresies whereof she was suspected. We may reasonably assume that the money was promptly paid, for on the following June 9 she was mercifully released from prison and restored to full control over her person and property. Had her sentence been confiscation, her whole estate would have gone to the royal treasury and the Inquisition would have received nothing; so mercy and thrift went hand in hand.

One is tempted to ask, in no spirit of irreverence, whether the interests of religion, in whose name the whole affair was performed, would have suffered if the third of Brianda's property had been quietly appropriated at the outset, without exposing her to years of shame and misery, and inducing her kindred and neighbors to bear false witness against her.

Gilabert Desplugas, at least, had no reason to congratulate himself on the result of his relations with the Inquisition. He followed the fate of his wife, and was burnt, presumably as a relapsed heretic, in the *auto de fé* of May 15, 1502.

APPENDIX.

I.

Visitas de Navios por el Santo Oficio (p. 89).

(MSS. of the Biblioteca Nacional of Madrid, S. 254 fol. 50).

Luego que qualquiera Navio entra y da fondo en la Baia de la Ciudad de Cadiz el guarda del Santo Officio previene al ynterprete a quien toca para que apreste lo necesario para visitarlo por el Santo Officio de la Ynquisicion, y avisandolo al Comisario señala ora para haçer la visita, si ya no acuerda haçerla en su casa y no ir abordo, porque lo haçen a su arbitrio de una o de otra manera.

El yntento del santo officio en estas visitas es que no se yntroduzgan en España libros, ymagines ni otras cosas de las prohividas, y esto no se consigue de ningun modo por este medio, porque si la visita se hace en tierra en casa del Comisario ya sabe que no se puede hallar alli lo que se pretende en el navio, y si se haçe la visita abordo sucede lo mesmo, pues no es posible en un Navio cargado y abarrotado ver otra cossa que las caxas de los marineros que estan sobre cubierta y ellos son tan cuidadosos (que saviendo como saven la ora de la visita) que no les dejaran embaraço en que topen, con que en todo se viene a estar a lo que declara el Maestre que es deçir, no trae cosa prohivida.

El Maestre del Navio que sea de visitar tiene obligacion de dar su salva para ello, mas el Comisario con color de que no es segura ni competente fleta un barco luengo, en 16 Reales o mas que obligue al Maestre a que lo pague y 4 Reales al Comisario, 4 Reales al Alguaçil, 4 Reales al Notario, 4 Reales al Guarda, 2 Reales a cada familiar de los que van que por lo menos son dos, y 4 Reales

al ynterprete y a mas de esto por decir se junta dinero para comprar un tapete para que con maior deçençia se baya a visitar, se le carga lo que le paresce al Comisario y con lo que sea sacado para esto no solo se pudiera haber sacado un tapete para el barco sino una alfombra para toda la Baia.

Si la visita se hace en casa del Comisario se le pregunta al Maestre de donde salio, que tanto tiempo ha, en que partes ha tocado, de que porte es el Navio, que gente Armas y Artilleria trae, adonde viene, que mercaderias trae y a que vienen consignadas, si trae libros, ymagines o otra cosa de las prohividas por el Santo Officio de la Ynquisicion, y Respondido a esto se le notifica que el ni su gente no traten de Religion con apercivimiento que seran castigados, y todo se escrive en un libro, y paga los derechos ariba Referidos enteramente, y el Barco y tapete (como si hubieran ydo abordo) y ademas de esto se Regula a dinero la polvora que se havia de gastar en tres pieças de Artilleria que se havian de disparar en la salva que se havia de hacer en el Navio si hubieran ydo a el y se paga y se embian algunos perniles queso o mantecas o otras cosas de las que traen en lugar de la merienda que havian de dar.

Si la visita se hace abordo del Navio sale el Maestre a Recevir al Comisario (y ordinariamente le Recive brindandole con cerbeça) luego entran en la Camara de popa y se asientan y se Recive la declaracion del Maestre como sea dicho y en el ynterin que se escrive el Guarda busca y bee las cajas de los marineros que estan sobre cubierta y los libros que halla los lleva al Comisario, Reconocelos el ynterprete y dice son de devocion de los marineros y se les buelben; acabado esto sacan de merendar y se bebe y brinda largamente, disparando pieças a los brindis en algunos navios, y demas de la merienda sea de embiar algo de Regalio al Comisario y notario y lo mesmo se haçe aunque aya que visitar y visiten 20 navios mas o menos en una tarde merendando en todos (en que hay hartas yndignidades que se escusa el decirlas porque se dejan conocer y no pocas estorciones porque todo esto lo haçen los Maestres forçados y contra su voluntad) y algunas veces se reduce a dinero (que se paga) la polvora que se havia de gastar en las salvas a despedirse, y los ministros que ban a las visitas (que ordinariamente son mercaderes) saben los generos que vienen en los Navios y procuran comprar lo que pueden para Rebenderlo despues. estos son los fructos que resultan al santo officio de tantos

aparatos, y de aqui se ocasiona que hallandose los Maestres vejados de estas diligencias y costa con el odio que tienen a tan santo Tribunal en lugar del santo officio le llaman el santo Ladronicio.

Paresçe se conseguiria algo mas y con mas deçençia y menos nota de los que lo padecen y de los que saben y ben el modo de las visitas si se quitase este genero de visitar y solo sin estruendo en derechos (o que fuesen mui cortos para Comisario y notario) declarase el maestre en casa del Comisario y que un ministro de satisfacion asistiese en la Aduana quando se abren para valuar los fardos frangotes, caxas y baules y demas cosas y los Reconociere y detubiese lo que tocase al santo officio teniendo alli lugar competente a la Autoridad del santo Tribunal a quien Representa el tal ministro, supuesto que en los navios por las Raçones dichas no se puede hallar lo que se busca y que por lo menos se quitan los excesos de los derechos y meriendas y demas cosas yndecentes.

II.

DECREE OF PHILIP V., MARCH 28, 1715, TO THE CONSEJO DE LA SUPREMA (P. 133).

(MSS. Royal Library of Copenhagen, No. 216 Fol.)

Influido y siniestramente aconsejado en la dependª del Edicto y proscripcion de el papel de el Fiscal Genl del Consejo tomé las resoluciones que esfe [*sic*] de Ynquisicion tendra presentes; pero ahora solidamente informado de lo que ha pasado en esto he conocido el poco acierto de ellas, pues jamas ha sido ni sera mi Real animo entrar la mano en el Santuario, ni querer otros derechos que los que conforme á la religion me puedan tocar, sobre los quales he consultado y consultaré al Consejo; en este conocimiento

tube por combeniente apartar de Mi Real Pª de Mi Corte y de sus empleos á los ministros que sinistra y dolosamente me aconsejaron sobre esto, y en consequencia de ello y del engaño que se ha padecido; he resuelto abrogar, suprimir y anular todos los decretos expedidos y resoluciones tomadas en razon de este ruidosa materia; y mando al Cardenal Giudice que sin replica ni escusa alguna buelva á exercer su empleo de Ynqor Grâl. que le supusieron vaco en virtud de una dejacion nula como forzada, ni admitida, ni hecha en manos de Su Santidad; y porque á esta resolucion es conseguente la restoracion del honor de los ministros del Consejo de Castilla que á titulo y por causa de esta dependencia han sido maltratados y depuestos; He resuelto tambien sean restituidos á el uso y exercicio de sus plazas en la misma forma que los tenian antes que salieron de el, y en las de asesores de ese Consejo los que estaban en posesion de ellas, sin que los atentados ni decretos que contra ellos se han expedido puedan en ningun tiempo prejudiciarles á su honor ni á sus pretenciones: participolo al Consejo de Ynquisicion para que lo tenga entendido. Dado en Buen Retiro á 28 de Marzo de 1715. Rubricado por S. M. á Dn Pablo de Moral y texada.

III.

RETRACTATION OF THE MAESTRE JUAN DE VILLALPANDO, AT SEVILLE, FEB. 28, 1627 (P. 308).

(Bodleian Library MSS. Arch. S. 130).

Yo, El Me Juan de Villalpando, clerigo presvito predicador y confessor en la presencia de V. Sª los SS. Inqres en la ciudad de Sevilla y su distrito y de los SStos Evangelios que ante mi estan

puestos y toco con mis manos, conociendome denunciado acusado y inquirido en este S^to^ Tribunal de las proposiciones que del processo resultan que contra me se a fulminado, y levemente sospechosso en ellas de aver creido y assentido propossiciones hereticas, heroneas, temerarias, escandolosas, malsonantes y supersticiones contra nr^a^ S. fee Catholica que este S^to^ Tribunal ha dado bastamente por provadas, y de que se me a mandado que retrate, y digo y conozco que son dignas de retratazion, y como hijo obediente de nr^a^ S^a^ Madre Yglesia y sus ministros, y en cumplimiento a sus mandados de mi libre y espontanea voluntad me retrato y aparto de los prop^nes^ siguientes.

I. De decir y afirmar o predicar que tenia facultad y licencia de la S^ta^ Inquisicion por absolver de los casos reservados a ella sin tener la dha facultad, la qual prop^n^ esta calificada por temeraria, sacrilega y escandolossa, y conozco que solamente puede publicar y tener la dha facultad y licenzia la persona a quien su Sant^d^ o sus legitimos ministros por ello diputados o nombrados se la dieren.

II. Y de decir o confessar que con galas y cavellos no se podian salvar, y que hazen repugnazion a la salvazion, como de prop^n^ heronea y escandalossa y cognozco y confiesso que las galas y cavellos no hazen repugnazion a la salvazion.

III. Y de dezir, praticar y enseñar que es lizito comulgar con dos o tres formas, y que con mas formas se recive mas gracia, como de prop^n^ temeraria, superstiziossa y en la segunda parte heronea y contra el comun usso de la yglesia, y confiesso y cognozco no ser lizito praticar el comulgar con mas de una forma, y assi mismo confiesso que muchas no dan mas grazia que una sola.

IV. Y de dezir y predicar que se podia comulgar muchas vezes en un dia como de prop^n^ temeraria, y confiesso que solo es lizito comulgar en un dia una vez, excepto los casos particulares en que la yglesia tiene determinado lo contrario.

V. Y de dezir, predicar y aconsejar que nadie se puede salvar sin orazion mental como de prop^n^ heretica, y confiesso que la orazion mental no es necessaria para la salvazion.

VI. Y de dezir y predicar que es de fee que ninguno se puede salvar sin la orazion mental como de prop^n^ que agrava la zensura de la precedente, y confiesso no ser de fee el ser necessaria la orazion mental para salvazion.

VII. Y de dezir que sola la orazion mental bastava sin la penitenzia y assi mismo que era mejor tener mucha orazion mental

que hazer mucha penitenzia como de propⁿ falsa y malsonante, y confiesso que la orazion mental no basta sin la penitenzia, y que no es mejor mucha orazion mental que mucha penitenzia.

VIII. Y de enseñar y aconsexar que la orazion bocal no era de importanzia para salvarse, como de propⁿ heretica, y confiesso ser de importanzia la orazion bocal para la salvazion.

IX. Y de predicar y aconsejar que por estar en la orazion mental se avia de dexar las obligaciones de su cassa y estado como de propⁿ erronea, y confiesso que no se han de dexar los obligaziones de su cassa.

X. Y de dezir y enseñar que para tener orazion mental era menester comer bien, como de propⁿ temeraria y escandalossa, y confiesso no ser necessario el comer bien para tener orazion mental.

XI. Y de dezir y aconsexar que se podia muy bien quedar los dias de fiesta sin oir misa, y en orazion mental bastava para suplirlo, como de propⁿ temeraria y escandalossa, y que tiene sabor de herror, y confiesso que no basta la orazion mental para suplir el quedarse sin missa los dias de fiesta.

XII. Y de dezir, predicar y aconsexar que no obediziessen a su superior y padres por tener orazion mental, como de propⁿ herronea, y confiesso que no se a de dexar de obedecer a los superiores y padres por tener orazion mental.

XIII. Y de aconsexar y mandar y praticar que no se tubiessen los oxos abiertos aunque alzassen el SSº Sacramento, como de propⁿ escandalossa y que mira a la heregia de los vegardos y al alumbrados, y confiesso que se han de tener los abiertos oxos quando alzasse el SSº Sacramento.

XIV. Y de enseñar que en la orazion no pienssen en nada sino esperar lo que Dios obrase, como de propⁿ temeraria y escandalossa y confiesso que en la orazion no a de aver ni se a de tener la dha suspension.

XV. Y de predicar que vengan a la orazion y sermon y a confessar y comulgar y si los padres lo defendieren atropellarlos y no hazer lo que ellos dixeren, y de dezir que malditos fuessen los cassados [por] la honra y la hazienda, que por esso se van los padres a los infiernos por cassar a sus hijos, como de propⁿ que quanto a la primera parte es temeraria y escandalossa, y quanto a la segunda es erronea y heretica, y confiesso que por venir a la orazion, sermon, y comunion no se an de atropellar los padres si

los defienden, y que los casamientos no son males ni los padres se van al infierno por cassar a sus hijos.

XVI. Y de predicar que no avia tal estado como el de las donzellas, y que era impossible los casados entrar en el cielo solo por lo estavan, como de propⁿ heronea y heretica, y confiesso que el estado de las donzellas no es el mejor de la yglesia, y que no este impossible entrar los cassados en el zielo porque lo son.

XVII. Y de predicar que el estado del matrimonio sera zenegal de puercos, como de propⁿ heronea y heretica, y confiesso que el estado de matrimonio no es zenegal de puercos.

XVIII. Y de dezir que se avia de tomar el estado de Veata, aunque Dios no quisiera, porque Dios queria lo mexor y lo era ser Veata, como de propⁿ blasfema, y dijo y confiesso que no se puede tomar estado contra la voluntad de Dios, y que ser Veata no es mexor.

XIX. Y de dezir que el estado de las Veatas es mexor quel de las monjas, como de propⁿ temeraria, escandalossa y heronea, y confiesso que el estado de las Veatas no es mexor quel de las monjas.

XX. Y de dezir que los tocamientos desonestos no eran pecado, como de propⁿ heretica, y confiesso y digo que los dhos tocamᵗᵒˢ son pecado.

XXI. Y de dezir que la señal verdadera de predestinazion [es] el aprovecharse luego de los medios que Dios da, y que sino se hazia sera estar precito y reprovo, como de propⁿ temeraria, y confiesso que no es señal de predestinazion ni reprovazion el provecharse luego de los medios que Dios da.

XXII. Y de dar cavellos, ropas o otras cossas de alguna persona por reliquias en nombre de algun Sᵗᵒ como de hecho sacrilego y supersticiosso, y confiesso que no se han de dar las dhas cossas por reliquias en nombre de ningun santo.

Todas las quales dhas propⁿᵉˢ este Sᵗᵒ Tribunal ha dado por reprovados, las retrato y deteste por ser de las calidades arriba referidas y me aparto y reboco dellas aunque por descargo de mi conziencia dijo que yo ni las entendi ni tube crei ni predique ni aconsexe en sentido heretico ni en otro ningun de los dhos que ellas en su vigor tienen ni entendiendo que seran hereticas, heroneas, temerarias, escandalossas, malsonantes y superstiziossas, sino sintiendo y entendiendo Catolicamente aunque en las palabras se me a provado que dixe mal y di ocasion a que de mi se sospe-

chasse como justamente se a sospechado que en los dhos sentidos tenia las dhas propnes de lo qual pido a Dios ñro sr y a la Sta madre y yglesia Catolica Romana perdon, y al Sto Ofo penitenzia con misericordia.

IV.

Auto de Fé OF FRAY FRANCISCO GARCÍA CALDERÓN (P. 315).

(MSS. Bibliothèque Nationale de France, fonds Dupuy, 15, fol. 158.—MSS. of Bodleian Library of Oxford, $\frac{4583}{112}$).

Breve relacion del auto de la Inquisicion que oy Sabado 27 de Abril de 1630 se hizo en la ciudad de Toledo, en el salon grande del dicho tribunal, desde las ocho hasta las diez de la mañana; haviendo concurrido todos los curas de la ciudad, calificadores, superiores de las religiones y colegios, con las personas mas graves, que serian como doscientos personas.

Leyó el proceso desde un pulpito D. Antonio Sevillano, secretario. El penitenciado lo oyó encima de una pequeña peana alta de media vara. Era el padre fray Francisco Garcia Calderon, confesor de las monjas de San Placido en Madrid, de la orden de San Benito el real de Valladolid, de edad de sesenta años. Salió á este auto con escapulario, pero sin cogulla ni correa, con una vela blanca en la mano y descubierto.

Entre otros gravissimos cargos que le hicieron, por no escandalizar se dejaron, y se notaron solamente estos.

Era alumbrado, tizon de aquel incendio de Sevilla, y en esta ciudad tuvó amistad con una alumbrada, á quien enseñó prejudiciales doctrinas, y en el articulo de la muerte la conoció carnalmente, predicó en sus honras heroicas virtudes de ella, juró en una

informacion de abono de su vida, y reportió reliquias suyas á personas reales, y procuró colocarle en lugar eminente. Porque el mal olor de su cuerpo no maltrattase el olfato, le metió copia de olores en el cuerpo secretamente con que el credito de buena se levantó.

A las monjas de san Placido enseñaba que los demonios no eran nuestros enemigos, antes coadjutores de nuestra salvacion; que asi les hizó creer que estaban endemoniadas, y se nombraban con nombre del demonio que las poseia; y porque estos demonios decian que las espantaban, durmió tres años en el claustro y las monjas confesaban que estos demonios eran apacibles y benignos.

Quando este Padre se sangraba, o alguna de las monjas de su apostolado, de la sangre seca y molida con pelo de las partes ocultas daba en papeles por reliquias, y lo pusieron junto al *signum crucis*.

Enseñaba que tocamientos y besos lascivos no eran pecados, como al tiempo de obrarlos el pensamiento estuviese en Dios; y el lo tenia con muchas monjas, pues de trenta y quatro las veinte y siete admitieron esto y otras disparates.

Afirmaba ser efetto de buena oracion el dolor de estomago; sobre el ponia su mano, y les daba escarpines y paños de remedio á su mitigacion, metiales la lengua en la boca y las manos en sus partes.

Comulgaba á las monjas dos ó tres veces cada dia y despues de comer; y el santissimo sacramento tenian casi siempre en la casa de la labor.

Hizó en san Placido un colegio apostolico con onze apostolas, y no doze, porque no huviesse Judas; y las apostolas eran monjas, y el Christo era él, y destas onze las siete eran las sanctissimas y aprobaban sus revelaciones, y todas doze havian de ser restauradores del mundo.

Para esta restauracion dixeron que tenia clara revelacion, que se fuese una persona á Roma que alli seria bien recibida y que le darian un capelo. Fue el compañero deste padre. Pero alli no hicieron caso de el; antes vieronle lleno de sarna. Dixó este: es el capelo que me prometió fray Francisco Garcia.

Este compañero no podia creer lo que las monjas publicaban de la santidad de este penitenciado; llevaronle un dia á la sala de la labor adentro, y una arrobandose dixó: Porque, incredulo, no creeis á fray Francisco Garcia? Con que intendio ser verdad por mucho tiempo.

Persuadió á cierta señora que dejandole gozar de ella, nacerá cierto infante que conquistaria la casa santa y en Jerusalem havria de colocar su silla pontifical y mandaria al mundo.

Sentencia.

Tenga carcel perpetua en el convento que le señalara la santa Inquisicion; ayune á pan y agua tres dias en la semana; no confese ni predique, ni haga Missa jamas; se confese con hombre docto; comulgue solo en las tres Pascuas del año; leasele esta sentencia tres veces: la primera en Madrid en san Placido, hallandose presentes las monjas de san Martin de Madrid, y despues de leida le den una disciplina; la segunda en san Martin de Madrid con otra disciplina de rueda; la tercera en san Benito de Valladolid con otra disciplina.

Juró, aunque lo resistió por muchas veces, juró de cumplir la sentencia y penitencia; no mostró sentimiento exterior, si bien se admiró de ver tanta gente; diósele copia de testigos para que respondiesse, y letrado á todas horas para que le defendiesse.

Prendieronle en Gerona, que si iba á Francia; no probó plenariamente el fiscal ser hereje; sufrió sin confesar tres fieros tormentos.

Es de gente honrada; tiene hermano colegial de Santa Cruz en la ciudad de Valladolid y su padre familiar del santo Officio.

V.

Preliminary Application for the Arrest of Josepha de San Luis Beltran (p. 363).

(MSS. of David Fergusson, Esq.)

El Dr Don Anttº de Gaviola Promotor fiscal deste sancto offº en la mexor via y forma qe aya lugar en derº premissas las solemnidades del parezco ante V. S. y querello y acussa criminal-

mente de Josepha de San Luys Beltran natural de la ciudad de Goaxosingo del obispado de la ciudad de los Angeles y digo = que siendo la sussodicha baptisada y confirmada gosando como tal de las gracias y Privilexios y exempsiones de que los demas Catholicos suelen y deven gozar contra la Professᵒⁿ que tiene fecha en el sancto baptismo ha hecho dicho y creydo contra lo que nuestra sancta madre yglesia Catholica Romana tiene, predica y enseña siguiendo la secta de los Alumbrados tratando de las Revelasiones llenas de cossas increybles y contra Buena Theoloxia con proposissiones expressamente hereticas y otras notas que se suelen dar en este sancto offᵒ engañando muchissimas personas viendose por spirituales afirmando tener revelassiones del Cielo y Platicas muy de hordinario con Jesu christo ñro señor y su gloriossissima madre senora nuestra y con otros muchos sanctos de la corte celestial en cuyos nombres dava Respuestos de diversas Personas y cossas que le Preguntaban personas de poco entendimiento que la tenian Por sancta Trayendolas engañadas por que la Regalassen y aprobecharse por este Camino de sus haziendas Reciviendolas con Titulo y nombre de limosnas que para Regalarse y comer y vever spendidamente como consta de las informassiones que presento con este mi Pedimiento. Y porque delitos tan graves no queden sin castigo.

A V. S. pido y suppᵒ sea pressa la dicha Josepha de S. Luis Beltran con secresto de sus vienes que estando en ellas protesto acussarla mas en forma y juro no ser de malisia.

Dᵒʳ Don Anttᵒ de Gaviola.

En la ciuᵈ de Mexico Martes siete dias del mes de Sepʳᵉ de mil y siesᵗᵒˢ y quarenta y nuebe años estando en su audiencia de la mañana los ssᵉˢ Inqʳᵉˢ Dʳᵉˢ Don Francᵒ de Estrada y escovedo, Don Juan Saenz de Mañozca, y Licenᵈᵒ D. Bernabe de la Higuera y Amarilla, Presstᵒ esta Peticᵒⁿ el S. Dʳ D. Antᵒ de Gaviola fiscal deste Sᵗᵒ Offᵒ y Pedio lo en ella Contenido.

Los dhos ssᵉˢ Inqʳᵉˢ dixᵒⁿ que la havian por pressᵈᵃ y que dando Ynformⁿ del en ella contenido eran prestos de hacer justicia.

El dho S. fiscal dixo que Para que Conste de lo contenido en su peticion hacia e hizo Pressᵒⁿ de la Ynformᵒⁿ y testificⁿᵉˢ Recevidas contra la suso dicha.

Ante mi

Lᵈᵒ Tomas Luys de Erenchun.

VI.

Act of Accusation against the Memory of Joseph Bruñon de Vertiz (p. 372).

(MSS. of David Fergusson, Esq.)

Presentada en onze de Mayo de seiscientos y sinquenta y siete años ante los S^res^ Inq^res^ Estrada, Mañosca y Higuera.

M. I.^S^or

El Licen^do^ Andres de Cabalça Abogado desta R^l^ Audiencia que hago officio de S^r^ fiscal deste s^to^ off^o^ Como mejor aya lugar en der^o^ paresco ante V. S. y digo que estandose siguendo causa criminal de fee contra Don Joseph Bruñon de Vertiz clerigo presbitero Natural de la Ciudad de Pamplona del Reyno de Navarra preso en Carçeles secretas por informacion que contra el se recivio por la qual consto seguir la secta de los hereges alumbrados tratando de revelaciones llenas de cossas increibles y contra toda buena Theulugia con proposiciones hereticas, erroneas, blasphemas, y escandalosas, y de otras muchas notas contrarias al pureza de la religion Catholica, y lei evangelica vendiendose por spiritual, y engañando con sus falsas doctrinas a muchas personas. Valiendose para el apoio de sus delirios de muchos lugares de la sagrada Escriptura del nuebo, y viejo testamento mal entendidos. y peor aplicados y aunque en el progresso de su caussa, parece haver pedido misericordia, y confessado haver sido ylluso y obsesso, y sugetadose a la creencia de la S^ta^ M^e^ Iglesia Catholica Romana. y a la recta censura de V. S^a^ fue sin duda fingida y simulada esta sugeçion y obediençia; porque despues con abominable furor volvio à afirmarse con todas sus heregias, y errores, y con mas obstinada dureza se declaro herege Luterano, donatista, sacramentario, y prorrumpio en horrendas heregias y Blasphemias hereticales contra la Iglesia Catholica Romana, y los sacros Sacramentos, contra la redempcion universal efectuada al precio y valor de la sangre de Xp^to^ S^r^ ñro. contra la pureza de la Virgen S^ma^ S^ra^ ñra. contra la canonizacion de los santos, contra los concilios. y

seguros aciertos de la Sta Sede apostolica en las materias de fee. como governada por el Spiritu Sto. y otras muchas y muy detestables. coinciendo tambien en las heregias de los hereges modernos como del processo consta: perseverando con obstinacion hasta su muerte sin muestra alguna de penitencia, antes afirmando en este arrto que Dios le tenia entregado a los Demonios y no tenia que esperar acabando sus miserables dios con este infernal desesperaçion: cuya muerte consta por la ynformacion recevida. Y porque pretendo poner acussacion contra el dho Don Joseph Bruñon de Vertiz para que su memoria y fama no quede entre los viventes, y en detestacion de tan abominables heregias su nombre sea borrado de sobre la haz de la tierra, y su memoria y fama desterrada de la memª de los hombres y sus delictos se hagan manifiestos y publicos y no quedan sin castigo siguiendose esta caussa conforme a dcho y estilo de este Sto Officio—

A V. Sª Pido y supp^co mde se me despache su carta de citaçion y edicto para çitar y llamar a los parientes del dho. Don Joseph Bruñon de Vertiz y a cada uno dellos y demas personas, que pretenden dcho a su memoria y fama para que dentro del termino peremptorio que les sea señalado comparescan a tomar copia y trdo de la acussaçion y salgar a la defensa de la caussa. y se siga con ellos hasta la final determinaçion. y por su absencia y reveldia passado el dho termo se le señalen los estrados de la audienª de V. Sª por bastantes donde se notifiquen todos los autos y Sªs y sobre todo serme hecho entero cumplimiento de Justª y en lo necesso &c.

Andres de la Cabalça.

VII.

Summary of Evidence laid before the Calificadores in the Case of Francisco Fernandez of Mexico, accused of Illuminism and Imposture (p. 374).

(MSS. of David Fergusson, Esq.)

Dichos y echos que se sacan para calificar de un Hombre español, cassado, y de oficio Mercachifle—

Cap. 1. Dicho hombre español con pretexto de que tira por el camino de la Virtud, al comulgar, que es mui frequente, hace barios ademanes defectos, dando a entender mucho amor de Dios, y da grittos y saltos en el propio comulgatorio diciendo Viva Jesus. Y assistiendo a un Sermon una quaresma en medio de el empezo a grittar y decir lo mismo y anadio, Tiemble el infierno, y haviendo sacado el Predicador una Calabera pidio al auditorio un padre nuestro y un Ave Maria por el Alma de dicha Calabera, y el dicho hombre español lebanto la voz diciendo que se iba al cielo.

Sea de leer a la letra el papel del fol. 2.

Cap. 2. Haviendo muerto un religioso que tenia un hermano mercader el dicho Hombre español fue al casa de dicho mercader y estando en la tienda despues de haverse saludado y platicado de cosas de Dios, le dijo que se consolase mucho por que le venia a dar unas buenas nuebes y eran que dicho su hermano el Religioso el Viernes Santo de aquel año se havia ido a gozar de Dios, y el dicho mercader le estime la noticia, y sin preguntarle como lo savia ni otra cosa le dio las gracias por ella y algunos reales, y le dijo volviese a otro dia, y con efecto volvio, y le dio un bestido de raso de la tierra y se fue, y al siguiente dia se dijo en el convente que el dicho Religioso se havia ido a gozar de Dios dicho Viernes santo, siendo mui comun entre hombres y mugeres y beatas que assisten a dicho convento y en todo el Varrio de el.

Cap. 3. Yten. Dicho hombre español fue a visitar a un Hospital

a un amigo suio que estaba enfermo y entre otras cosas de consuelo que le dijo fue que el dicho Religioso estaba goçando de Dios.

Cap. 4. Yten. Haviendo muerto repentinamente un Hombre sin hacer testamento ni recibir los santos Sacramentos ni alcançar mas que apretar la mano a un Sacerdote; el qual era cassado y havia mas de veinte años que no hacia vida con su muger, y vivia amancebado con una muger que murio y despues se amancebo con otra la qual estaba actualmente el dia y noche que murio dicho hombre en su casa, y saliendo de una Iglesia dos sugetos dijo en secreto el uno al otro que el Alma de dicho Hombre se havia ido al cielo, y presumio al que solo refirio que aquello lo habria dicho dicho Hombre español, y con efecto salio cierta su sospecha por haverselo preguntado, y le dijo se lo havia dicho el dicho Hombre español.

Cap. 5. Yten. Dicho Hombre español de doce años a esta parte todas sus conversaciones son de Amor de Dios y de cosas santas y buenas, y hablando de ellas suele tener temblor y furor, y le da mui de continuo, por lo qual lo an echado de algunas Yglesias.

Cap. 6. Yten. En otra ocasion estando dicho Hombre español en una tiendecilla de ropa de la tierra que tenia, llegandole a dar seis reales de limosna para aiuda a vestir a unos Pobres, le dio dicho furor y temblor con tal vegemencia que se dio una cabezada contra una tabla de dicha tiendecilla y con la misma vehemencia le dio en otra ocasion en una casa delante de muchas Personas.

Cap. 7. Yten. Haviendo entrado dicho Hombre español en una casa a ver el dueño de ella empezo a tratar de cosas de Dios, dando buenos consejos y se lebanto de la silla y comenzo a dar bozes, diciendo Santo, Santo, y se quedo por un trato como suspenso.

Cap. 8. Yten. Dicho Hombre español en una ocasion haviendo acabado de comulgar se empezo a estremezer con gran fuerza.

Cap. 9. Yten. Dicho Hombre español haviendo entrado con otros en una Mina llebaron una Imagen de nuestra Señora y se pusieron a rregar el Rosario y decir las litanias, y se quedaba dicho Hombre español como suspenso.

Cap. 10. Haviendo muerto en el Real un hombre en casa de un vecino, dijo el dicho vecino que el alma de aquel hombre estaba en el cielo, y los que lo dieron presumieron lo abria dicho el dicho Hombre español por saber que de otras Almas de difuntos havia dicho lo mismo.

Cap. 11. Yten. Estando en su tienda cierto hombre llego a ella dicho Hombre español y le dijo algunas cosas y consejos en orden a su aprobechamiento espiritual, diciendo muchas cosas de el temor de la muerte y de el Infierno, se quedo como suspenso, y habiendo buelto dijo havia oido todo el ruido de el Infierno, Perros, Gallos, y demas Animales, y que havia oido una voz que dijo ia benzio; y concurriendo en diferentes Yglesias a exercicios estando predicando en una de ellas en el acto de contricion empezo a dar bramidos como un toro y a gritar de manera que alboroto la Yglesia a gritos, y lo mando echar de ella el Religioso que hacia los exercicios, y en otras Yglesias a sucedido lo mismo.

Cap. 12. En otra ocasion acabando de comulgar dicho Hombre español dio un grito que lo oieron en toda la Yglesia, diciendo fuego de el Amor de Dios.

Cap. 13. Yten. Estando dicho Hombre español en cierta Yglesia en una capilla de San Joseph de noche haciendo exercicios y cantando alabanças de Dios, y de el SS. Sacramento, estando dicho Hombre distante de un Altar en que estaba una Imagen de S. Joseph, largo la capa y el sombrero y dio una carera, y llegando al Altar dijo en bozes altas assi se alaba a Dios y de el encontron que dio se quedo como atarantado,puesta la mano en la fuente.

Cap. 14. Yten. Dicho Hombre español dijo a otro que estando en la capilla de la Purisima le havia echo Dios fabor de que el religioso que queda expresado arriba en el Cap. 2 havia estado cinco dias en el Purgatorio, y que se havia ido al cielo.

Cap. 15. Yten. Dicho hombre español en repetidas ocasiones a dicho al Hombre de el Capitulo antezedente que cada dia rezibe fabores de la mano liberal de Dios, y los esta experimentando pues no teniendo oficio alguno para sustentarse y sustentar su muger y tres hijos no le faltaban diez o doze reales que a menester que le dan algunas personas a quienes les trata de cosas espirituales, siendo su genero de buscar la vida tratar de cosas espirituales para tener de que sustentarse.

Cap. 16. Haviendo muerto cierto Hombre rico llego dicho Hombre español al referido en los dos capitulos y le dijo, quiere usted saber Amigo quan grande es la piedad de Dios? pues quien dira que un hombre tan sobrado y tan rico como el Cappitan fulano me lo puso Dios seis dias en mis hombros para irse al cielo, y oiendole lo referido le dijo a Amigo quien supiera la verdad de las cosas que pasan en el mundo, a que respondio dicho Hombre

español, luego Vm^{d} duda, es tan cierto esto como estar Dios en el cielo.

Cap. 17. Yten. El Hombre referido en los capitulos antecedentes viendo pasar por junto a su tienda al dicho Hombre español le llamo y dijo encomendase a Dios al Hombre dicho arriba que havia muerto de repente y estaba amancebado. Y pasados quatro o cinco dias volvio a la tienda el dicho Hombre español y dijo estoi echo mil pedaços, que tarde tubimos aier en una resa donde havia siete o ocho personas, gente de importancia, y les dije a todos, Mis Hermanos hagamos empeño por esta alma, y fue Dios servido de llebarla al cielo.

Cap. 18. Yten. El dicho Hombre español dijo al referido en los capitulos antecedentes, con ocasion de haber muerto un ministro superior, que havia estado en casa de una muger de gran virtud y le havia dicho, hagamos por el Alma de dicho ministro Hermana, y que se fue luego al cielo.

Cap. 19. Deseando dicho Hombre conocer a la muger contenida en el capituto antecedente, lo insinuo a dicho Hombre español, y le dijo lo llebaria, y con efecto fueron un dia juntos a casa de dicha muger, y despues de haverla saludado, la dijo dicho Hombre español, Hermana aqui biene nuestro hermanito a que seamos todos hermanos espirituales y te traia dos Amigos (dando a entender eran dos difunctos) pero ya te quite de ese cuidado, y le dijo ella no me traiga Vm^{d} de esos dos hombres que desde de la otra tarde e quedado mui trabajosa; y antes habia dicho el dicho Hombre español al otro eran las Almas de dos Hombres que habian muerto en dos ciudades de esta nueba españa, y que en la capilla de nuestra Señora de la Antigua las havia echado al cielo, y les dijo a ellas bajan mañana que es dia de la SS. Virgen que esta tan bella, tan bella, tan bella, y al dezir esto se enfurecio y se puso en cruz, apretando los ojos y los dientes, dandole tremores.

Cap. 2 de el Cap. 19. Y causando admiracion el caso a dicho hombre, dijo el dicho Hombre español esta noche es noche de alegria, y les respondieren los que se hallaban presentes, que eran este dicho Hombre, una vieja y un viejo, y como sique es, y entonces dicho Hombre español volviendose a ellas y dando unos resoplidos, como quando uno rocia con la boca, dijo haia, a, alegria de Maria, y quan por esto lo dijo, dio la moça con su cuerpo a modo de mal de corazon, y la vieja de la misma manera, dandose de palmadas en los pechos, y el dicho Hombre español y el viejo

se lebantaron a tener a la moza, y le decia en el nombre de Dios todo poderoso y de tu padre espiritual que te sosiegues y se quedaba ella algo quieta, y luego volvia otra vez con el mismo mal como de corazon, y el dicho Hombre español le rezo una Magnifica en latin, y al cabo de un buen rato se lebanto la moza de repente dando broncos y el dicho Hombre español la tenia de la mano dicienda alegria, alegria, por mas de quarenta vezes, y dijo al dicho hombre que pusiese su mano sobre la de la dicha moza, el qual la puso con mucho temor y la tento mui fria, y los de los engarrotados, y dijo dicho hombre español esta comunion de mañana les pido a ustedes por estas almas, y la vieja y la moza y el dicho hombre dieron a dicho Hombre español tres o quatro reales, y haviendolos guardado dijo para que vean las misericordias que usa Dios con esta hormigita y el espiritu que Dios me a dado, en lo mismo que emos estado nosotros está nuestra hermana.

Cap. 20. Yten. Dijo el dicho Hombre español al referido que atrabesando el cimenterio de la Cathedral vio benir un entierro, y que se havia sentado en las gradas mui triste, y que a la noche havia ido en casa de la dicha muger, y volviendo la cara vio el difunto que llebaban a enterrar, y llego a la muger y le dijo aqui traigo un Amigo, hagamos empeño, y que se fue al cielo.

Cap. 21. Yten. El dicho Hombre español a dicho al referido en los capitulos antecedentes que un amigo suio mercader tiene once legiones de demonios en una pierna que le atormentan, y que en tocando un pie de los suios con el de dicho mercader oie decir mientes embustero, pero que asi que participe el dicho Hombre español de la sangre de nuestro Señor Jesu Christo con la boca le da una roziada en la pierna, y queda descansado, y que el modo de participar de la sangre de el costado de nuestro señor Jesu Christo es llegar su boca al costado y chuparla, y que los mismos fabores havia el recivido que sancto Domingo y San Francisco, pues la Virgen Maria le havia dado de mamar de sus purisimos pechos y Christo nuestro señor de su sanctisimo costado.

Cap. 22. Yten. En el dia de la Asumpcion de nuestra señora ce juntan en la cassa de dicho Hombre español diferentes personas de ambos sexos, y hacen a modo de labatario con cinco pobres en onra de las cinco llagas, y les dan algunas cosas de bestir, y dicho Hombre español laba los pies a los pobres y se los besa, y entonces hace muchos como arrobos y tremores, y dize a bozes que me quemo, y despues se sientan y comen con mucho regalo.

Cap. 23. Yten. En algunas ocasiones que el hombre referido en los capitulos y otros hablaron delante de dicho Hombre español de diferentes autoridades de San Augustin y otros sanctos Doctores, decia el dicho Hombre español, perdonandome el S^to^ Doctor, dijera yo esto y esto, contrario a la de los sanctos Doctores.

Cap. 24. Yten. Dice dicho Hombre español que estando en un Real de Minas saco un predicador una calabera a laqual pregunto si estaba en el cielo que selo digera y si en el infierno tambien; y que el havia lebantado la voz y dicho al cielo, al cielo, por muchas vezes, y que desde entonces le temblaban el cura y los confesores, y que en dicho Real tubo asistencia por mas de ocho meses, y en todo este tiempo comulgo mui frequentemente sin haverse confesado por no tener de que.

Cap. 25. Yten. En las asistencias que el dicho Hombre español hacia en cierta Iglesia a los exercicios, por los gritos y meneos que hacia le mando el superior echar de la Iglesia, y se fue a vez con dicho superior y le dijo que si queria certificarse de el y su vida le viese en el confesionario y no le quiso oir dicho superior.

Cap. 26. Yten. Estando en su tienda el hombre arriba expresado acostado en un petate llego dicho Hombre español y le movio y dijo no te acuestes en pecado no amanezcas condenado, a que le respondia, quando te queman, y dicho Hombre español dijo que ya lo havia quemado nuestro señor en los dios de Santo Domingo y San Ignacio, y le causo admiracion a dicho hombre lo que lo dijo por no saver si Dios le havia rebelado el que estaba o no en pecado.

Cap. 27. Yten. Dijo el dicho Hombre español al referido que estaba echo mil pedaços de cansado por que la noche antes havia ido a una casa a una visita, y que le vino un mal pensamiento deshonesto con una muger que alli estaba y que se havia lebantado, coxido al demonio de los orejas y dijo aiudenme aqui, que aqui lo tengo, y que todos le dieron de patadas contra el suelo.

Cap. 28. Yten. Otro hombre distinto del arriba referido dice haver visto muchas veces enagenarse al dicho Hombre español haviendose tratado de cosas de Dios, estando de rodillas, en cruz o en pie, y quando vuelbe en si es dando gracias al señor y alabandole con acciones humildes, y que en las Iglesias estando predicando le a oido dar vozes diciendo fuego que me abraso, y Sancto, Sancto, Sancto.

Cap. 29. Yten. Dice el dicho que a oido decir al dicho Hombre español bebe sangre de las llagas de Christo nuestro Señor y que rocia a las circunstantes con la mesma sangre que dize bebe y el Señor le comunica.

Cap. 30. Yten. Dicho Hombre español dijo en una ocasion a este que el Señor le a dado poder sobre el Demonio y que quantas veces queria le agarraba las orejas, y que en una ocasion le vio que parecia luchaba con alguna persona sin ver con quien y que tenia entonces el rostro mui encendido y hacia fuerza con las manos y despues se sosego y empezo a alabar a la Santisima Trinidad.

Cap. 31. Yten. Haviendo muerto de una puñalada a un hombre que no pudo recivir los sacramentos, llego a dicho Hombre español el hombre arriba primero referido y le conto el caso, y dijole encomendase a Dios a que respondio dicho Hombre español que si haria, y de alli a pocos dias le vio y dijo que el dia antes se havia ido al cielo entre siete y ocho de la noche.

Cap. 32. Yten. Haviendo ido el dicho Hombre español a la tienda de el referido, le dijo asustado que le havian citado para que fuese en casa de un sacerdote a rreconocerle el espiritu, mas que no se le dava nada, qui si le aprestaban mucho le diria le oiese de confesion. Y preguntandole sobre las apariciones de las almas, dijo que esso lo afirmaria, y era mui cierto.

Cap. 33. Yten. En una ocasion dijo dicho Hombre español al referido que el parlaba estas materias espirituales con las personas que le daban algo para que el tenia mujer y hijos que sustentar, y que el que quisiera combersacion espiritual abriese un libro y alli lo aprendiese; y dicho hombre lo tiene experimentado, asi el como con otras personas de las quales junta dicho Hombre español el dinero que necesita para su sustento no teniendo otro oficio con que buscar la vida.

Cap. 34. Yten. Haviendo dicho el referido hombre al dicho Hombre español de si llegaria a noticia de este Santo Tribunal su genero de vida, le respondio que no se le daba nada, que el haria bailar a los señores Inquisidores, y quejandose el dicho Hombre español de un religioso lego hijo del referido hombre por que le havia reñido el que no andubiera con apariciones y arrobamientos, por haver dicho dicho Hombre español delante de dicho religioso lego, que era angel de luz y estaba en gracia, dijo que dicho

religioso no sabia ni aun mondar tomates en la cozina, hablando de el con menosprecio.

Cap. 35. Yten. Haviendo muerto a otro hombre con las mesmas circunstancias que el de el Cap. 31, llego dicho Hombre español a la tienda de el referido, quien le dijo le encomendase a Dios, y dicho Hombre español volvio de alli a algunas dias y le dijo que la noche antes havia estado en casa de la muger que queda expresada y que entre siete y ocho de la noche lo havian sacado del Purgatorio.

VIII.

CASE OF JOSEPH LUIS NAVARRO DE LUNA Y MEDINA (P. 387).

(Archivo municipal de Sevilla, Seccion especial, Siglo XVIII., Letra A, Tomo 4, No. 49).

Relacion en substancia de la causa de Don Joseph Navarro Medina y Luna, Canonigo de la Iglesia Colegial de San Salvador de Sevilla.

Sabado tres de Marzo, deste presente año de mil seiscientos noventa y uno, estando en la sala principal del Santo Tribunal de la Inquisicion de esta ciudad de Sevilla, juntos veintecuatro de los mas condecorados y doctos hombres de la dicha ciudad, los quales avian sido llamados ante dia por los señores Inquisidores y estando abierta la puerta del Tribunal para que todos entrasen

Fué sacado en sotana sin cinto ni bonete con sanbenito de dos aspas el licenciado Don Joseph Luis Navarro Medina y Luna, Presbitero, Canonigo de la Iglesia Colegial de San Salvador deste ciudad de Sevilla, aviendo estado preso quarenta y seis meses y seis dias en la carcel del Santo Tribunal, y estando asi en pie empezó uno de los Secretarios del Santo Oficio a leer la causa del dicho reo, que contenia ciento y veinte y seis capitulos, gastando

en la acusacion y descargos quatro horas y media no obstante que en el proceso que en publico se leyo se omitieron muchos capitulos de los ciento y veinte y seis por las santas y insondables razones que para ello asistirian a este Santo Tribunal. En fin este Monstruo de iniquidades, a quien con tanta adequacion le conviene la descripcion que Jacobo Gualthero haze del impio Waldo—*Paupertatis obserbationes profitebatur: eo que specioso palio quos expargebat errores contegebat: quamquam enim idiota prorsus erat, ubi tamen libros aliquos* (Despertador espiritual y Luz de luz divina) *nonnullis Scripturæ locis conspersos sibi arguere non erubuit.* Este pues a quien parece definir nuestro Gualthero fue condenado por herege Arriano, por enseñar que el verbo divino era menor que el Padre; por Nestoriano por reconocer en Christo dos personas; por Calvinista por afirmar perder el hombre el libro albedrio caiendo en pecado; por Luterano por negar la adoracion de las Imagines, por yr contra las Indulgencias. Fué grandisimo hipocrita, pues con su humildad paliata, teniendo en realidad una soberbia luciferina pudo engañar a tantas almas sencillas perber tiendolas con sus malas y dañadas doctrinas, y como si estas tan perniciosas doctrinas no bastare que practicar el como acustumbraba, enseñaba y hacia que practicasen los desdichados que le seguian su doctrina y errores y la de los Alumbrados, Agapetos, Trinitarios, Waldenses, Pseudo-Apostolos, y del hijo de perdicion Molinos, siendo tan sequaz deste que no se apartaba un punto de su perniciosa direccion; principalmente en todo lo que toca la oracion, queriendo que sus hijos pasasen de un vuelo a la contemplacion y oracion de fe obscura, añadiendo no devian desechar las malas sugestiones ó deseos que en la dicha oracion de fee les ocurriesen, sino que resignando el libre albedrio en Dios, le avian de dejar el cuidado y el pensamiento de todas nuestras cosas, y desear que hiciese en ellos sin ellos su divino querer, y consiguientemente enseñaba este reo, que aunque en este su genero de oracion, sobreviniese sueño y se durmiese, no por esa se dejaba de orar y contemplar actualmente, porque era una resignacion y oracion y oracion y resignacion, añadiendo que mientras este duraba, duraba la oracion. De todo esto se leyeron lastimosos exemplos, practicados por algunas personas sencillas que se dejaron engañar de este; entre los quales no deja de asombrar el que se refirio de una buena muger a quien este reo avia puesto en la oracion de quietud sin permitir se entregase ni un instante a la

pura meditacion, aun en los principios de la vida espiritual, con precepto de que comulgase todos los dias. y lo que mas es, sin saber persignarse, ni los misterios que qualquier fiel Cristiano esta obligado a saber, como se conocio en la incapacidad en que por ignorarlos le hallo un confesor para poderla absolver. Otra ó otras muchas personas principalmente religiosas tenian por su mandato esta ociosa oracion en la cama, ó sentadas, faltando por no interrumpirla a las obligaciones del choro y su comunidad, y a estas tales las aclamaba por Santas, imbentando por acreditar sus embustes, muchos favores que de Dios recebian, entre las quales una a quien con nombre de Serrana introduze en el libro de Luz de luz divina. Era la de su mayor estimacion, y sin duda porque era la mas engañada, y quiera Dios no aya sido la mas ó una de las mas desgraciadas, ó por aver muerto en su error, a que no ayuda poco el que el dicho Navarro la celebró despues de muerta por santa, publicando estaba en el choro de las Virgines Prudentes, y añadiendo se le avia aparacido a el en traje glorioso, y para acreditar este delirio la avia hecho pintar en un traje que quizas el avia soñado en alguno de los engarrotamientos que posible es ubiese tenido en su diabolica oracion.

Enseñaba mas este prevaricador a sus discipulos que sintiendo remordimiento en sus conciencias podian yr a recebir el santisimo Sacramento de la Eucharistia sin que primero se limpiasen con el de la penitencia, en lo qual ya se vee quan claramente contravenia al decreto del Santo Concilio de Trento, seccion trece capitulo siete, y es esto lo mas, sino que propasandose a los delirios de Luthero affirmaba que en tales casos la obediencia del padre espiritual que les mandaba comulgasen sin averse antes confesado hacia las vezes del Sacramento de la Penitencia.

Practicaba tambien este herege dar dos ó mas formas consagradas a sus hijos quando los comulgaba, porque estaba persuadido que quantas mas formas recebian, recebian mas Dios, y en esto bien se vee seguia a los hereges llamados *Pauperes de Lugduno* quienes practicaban guardar para todo el año las formas consagradas en el Jueves Santo, porque decian tenian estas mas Dios, y causaban mas gracia que otras qualquiera consagradas en otro tiempo; y esta parece aludia lo que en una ocasion dixo este reo a uno que le combidaba para que asistiese en una fiesta del Santisimo Sacramento; dixole pues, que el tenia mejor Dios en otra parte que alli, que asi que no queria dejar a su Dios por asistir a este.

Aunque en el proceso de la causa no se dixo nada de su incontinencia, empero se dexo entender bastantemente seria como la de sus Maestros, pues uno de los capitulos de la acusacion era decir que enseñaba este segundo Molinos, a sus discipulos executasen despues de su oracion los mobimientos de qualquier calidad que fuesen que hubiesen sentido en ella, de lo qual bien se infiere el haria lo mismo; y es tambien mas que cierto, que un puro ocio, como el que estos intentan en su oracion se le havian de ofrecer muchos y torpes mobimientos, principalmente quando se ponian a la oracion despues de haver comido y bebido muy bien, como lo testifica lo que hacia en un cierto convento desta ciudad adonde se iba bien de mañana a dezir Misa, y despues de Misa sin mas accion de gracias que desnudarse, se ponia con sus hijas de espiritu a combersar y regalarse mui bien y despues desta dilixencia salia a la Iglesia mui circunspecto y se ponia sentado en una silla a tener oracion de quiete. Y en una ocasion de estas en que acaso acabando de comulgar una persona avia prorrumpido algunos efectos sensibles le vino diciendo no le acontiese otra vez venirle a inquietar en su quietud con sus suspiros infructuosos porque juzgaba este embustero con su maestro Molinos que la devocion sensible no buscaba ni deseaba a Dios sino a si mesmo, y que asi todo lo sensible en la vida espiritual era inmundo y puerco.

Son tantos los errores deste Antechristo (bien merecido nombre pues era tan enemigo de la humanidad Santisima de christo bien nuestro) que no es facil nombrarlos todos, si bien de lo dicho se podra inferir que lobo tan carnicero avia estado encubierto devajo de piel de una oveja. Todo esto parece podia en su summa ignorancia tener alguna escusa si con diabolico atrevimiento no se ubiera determinado a defender sus desatinos, interpretando mal los textos de la Escriptura y atrebiendose a ser impostor de falsos textos en los sacrados evangelios de donde se a originado sin duda el aver estado tanto tiempo preso en la Inquisicion obligando juntamente a los Señores Inquisidores hiciesen con el las dilixencias en las leyes permitidas para que confesase sus errores. En fin despues de averlos confesado y abjurado dellos fué absuelto, pribandole de oficio y beneficio, de andar a caballo, traer sobre si oro, plata, perlas, y piedras preciosas, vestir seda, chamelote, y paño fino, le desterraron por ocho años desta ciudad y su arçobispado, de la villa de Madrid y ocho leguas en contorno, man-

dandole estar recluso los dos primeros de los dichos ocho años en el Hospital que se le señalare, donde sea enseñado por dos calificadores en los Misterios de Nuestra Santa Fee.

IX.

CASE OF MARIA DE LOS DOLORES (P. 398).

(Archivo Municipal de Sevilla, Seccion Especial, Siglo XVIII., Letra A. Tomo 4, No. 56).

En veinte y cuatro de Agosto de mil setecientos ochenta y una celebró el Santo Oficio auto publico en la Yglesia de San Pablo del Orden de Predicadores para declarar herege formal, apostata, iludente, ilusa, rebocante, fingidora de revelaciones, pertinaz e impenitente á María de los Dolores Lopez, de estado honesto, natural de este ciudad de Sevilla, de edad de quarenta y cinco años y ciega desde los once. Comensó á leerse la causa á las nueve en punto de la mañana, y se concluyó á las doce y media, y en ella estaba convencida de Molinista y Flagelante, y de los demas crimines de que fué declarada, á presencia de un numerosisimo pueblo de gentes de todas clases, y relajada á la jurisdiccion del Señor Don Francisco Domezain, Asistente de la dicha ciudad y á su Theniente Don Juan Antonio de Santa María, quien despues de haverse instruido en la causa en la relacion publica se entregó la dicha reo en el Juzgado Secular y pronunció la sentencia condenandola á ser quemada viva, ó muerta si se convirtiese antes de la execucion. Asi fué: confesó en la carcel, lloró sus pecados, fué absuelta y conducida al Quemadero donde le dieron garote y la quemaron en Sevilla como á las cinco y media de la tarde de dicho

dia, mes, y año. Todo lo presencie y de todo testifico—Fray Vicente Ruiz, Mercenario Calzado.

El herror capital de esta muger era decir que las acciones en si malas dexaban de serlo por la voluntad de Dios que las hacia buenas quando queria, como se vió en Abrahan, pues siendo malo el matar le mandó Dios sacrificase á su hijo, y obedeciendo al Señor hizo una accion muy meritoria. Que ella seguia en todo lo que la dictaba su Angel, siendo al modo de la Burra de Balan, que aunque quisiesen llevarla por otro camino se oponia su Angel, y la obligaba á ir por aquel. Por consiguiente no podian sacarla del circulo de que las acciones que hacia solo las tenia por malas por que se lo decian, mas no por que creyese lo fueran en ella, etc. ni en otros à quienes subcediese lo mismo.

Lo de la ceguera tubo mucho de fingimiento, pues leia, escrivia, y bordaba, aunque esto pretendiendo fuese milagroso.

INDEX.

ABECEDARIO spiritual of Osuna, 222
Academies, transactions of, 170
Acta Sanctorum, quarrel over, 75
Adagia of Erasmus, 97
Adam, his worship recommended, 361
Adrian VI. his precautions against heretic books, 27
he favors Erasmus, 33
asks the prayers of Francisca Hernandez, 260
Aerschot, Duke of, and Luisa de Carrion, 356
Agostino, Ant. his *Canones*, 154
Agreda, Madre, 321
her books condemned, 323
canonization proceedings, 325
Agueda de Luna, Madre, 392
Albert, Cardinal, on María de la Visitacion, 338
Alcaráz, Fermin de, 418, 420
Alcaráz, Pedro Ruiz, 252
Alcavala, books released from, 20, 151
Aleander on Erasmus, 33
Alexander VI. introduces censorship, 22
Alexander VII. condemns Moya's *Opusculum*, 103
Alexandria, persecution of Jews in, 443
Alfonso X, his censorship of booksellers, 17
his translation of the Bible, 19
Alliaga, Luis de, opposes the Granadan forgeries, 111
Almería, capitulation of, 460
Alonso de Espina, his stories of Jews, 441, 447
Alonzo y Padilla, his list of publications, 94, 202
Alumbrados, 235, 245
impeccability ascribed to, 248
their errors, 250, 253, 302
of Llerena, 296
Alumbrados burnt at Seville in 1630, 308
succeeded by Molinistas, 384
Aluminados, 219
Alvarez, Baltasar, 293
Alvarez, Hernando, an Alumbrado, 298
Alzaiber, Manuel, case of, 174
Amaurians, 214
Amort, Eusebius, on revelations, 324, 329
Ana García, case of, 395
Andalusia, expulsion of Jews, 438
Andrada, Andrez Nuñez de, on vernacular Scripture, 55
Angela de Foligno, 225
Angoulême, Duc d', occupies Spain, 178
Annihilation of the Will, 225
Antonio de la Cruz, 306
Antonio de Jesus, 290
Antonio, Nicolás, his advice as to the *Plomos*, 115
Antwerp Index, 79
Aparicio, Luis, on worship of Adam, 361
Aparisi, Padré, teaches Molinist errors, 415
Apostolical Constitutions, censorship in, 15
Apostólicos, 180
Appeals to Rome forbidden, 100
Approbations not to be printed, 158
Aquinas on demonic deceptions, 328
Arabic Bible texts prohibited, 45
books prohibited, 21, 23
Aragon, prohibition of Scripture, 16
early censorship, 18
independent censorship, 152
united to Castile in 1707, 154
Alumbrados in, 258
Arbués, Pedro, miracle after death, 474

Arce y Reynosa orders fictitious saints worshipped, 118
case of nuns of San Plácido, 318
case of Luisa de Carrion, 357
Arenas, Antonio de, 383
Argumosa, Dr. Diego, 417, 420
Arian books prohibited, 16
Árias de Ávila, Juan, punishes Jews, 442
Arnaldo de Vilanova, his writings burnt, 19
Arques, Sigismundo, his trial, 50
Arruego, Pedro de, 358
Art, censorship on, 201
Artillery salutes in *visitas de navios*, 89
Astorga y Cespedes withdraws licences, 94
Authors, defence allowed to, 75, 137
heretic, their names suppressed, 65
Authorship discouraged, 207
Ávila, *auto de fé* of 1491, 458
preserved from pestilence, 466
Azpilcueta on the Celestina, 201
on faith and charity, 241

BALMES on Catholic intellectuality, 190
Balvoa, Juan de, his prosecution threatened, 204
Barambio, Francisco, his book condemned, 130
Barcelona, vernacular Gospels burnt, 186
Bardaxí, Brianda de, 469
Barefooted Carmelites, their persecution, 284
their dissensions, 287, 288
Molinism among, 391
Baronius, quarrel over his *Annales*, 128
Basque translation of Scripture, 53
Beata de Torroz, 391
Beatas, 217
Beatas revelanderas, 230, 337
Beatification of Juan de Ribera, 295
of San Pedro de Alcántara, 300
of Mariana de Jesus of Madrid, 350
of Mariana de Jesus of Quito, 351
Beghards and Beguines, 214
Belando, his *Historia civil*, 198
Benedict XIV. on María de Agreda, 325
on martyred children, 467
Bermeja, María, 414
Bernal, Juan, an Alumbrado, 298
Berquier, Louis de, burnt, 32
Berrocosa, Fray, his condemnation, 134
Berthold of Mainz, his censorship, 22
Bethulius, Xistus, his works condemned, 97
Bible, see Scripture
Hebrew, its possession an evidence of guilt, 470
Vatable, trouble with, 51
Biblia Regia of Árias Montano, 52
Binding, importation of, prohibited, 158
Bishops, their licence required, 61
their jurisdiction, 72
claim licence to read heretic books, 92
their censorship forbidden, 152, 156
their censorship in Aragon, 152
in Navarre, 157
their censorship revived, 169
their censorship in 1824, 179
their existing censorship, 185
their neglect of duty, 217
their non-residence, 271
Blois, boy crucified at, 440
Board of Censors, 141
Bonaparte, Joseph, his legislation, 173
Bonifaz, Manuel Quintano, 120
Books, heretic, brought to Spain, 27, 69, 91
burning of, 18, 25, 27, 57
unnecessary, suppressed, 207
Booksellers, penalties imposed on, 23, 50, 60, 148
early supervision over, 17
in 1798, 164
Book-shops, rigid inspection of, 170
purging of, 60, 84
in 1824, 179
Borja, San Francisco de, censorship of his works, 222
his troubles, 293
Borrow, George, his *Bible in Spain*, 180
Branda, Card. canonizes St. Werner, 462
Bray-sur-Seine, Jewish outrage at, 440
Brisighella, Index of, 78
Brocense, el, prosecution of, 192
Brussels, Jewish sacrilege in, 445
Bulls, papal, their treatment in Spain, 99

Burdens on authorship, 206
Burning of books, 18, 25, 27, 57

CAADEN, crucifixion in, 443
Cáceres, saintly nuns of, 296
Cadiz, *visitas de navios* in, 89
Córtes of, 172
Constitution of, 174, 177, 180
Calasanz, San José de, 295
Caldera, his *Mistica Teologia*, 304
Calderón, Francisco García, case of, 309
relation of his auto de fé, 488
Calificacion, 74
of Mariana de Jesus, 348
Camacho, Gomez, 301
Cano, Melchor, on translations of Scripture, 53
on the pretensions of Rome, 124
assails Carranza, 272
criticizes Luis de Granada, 281
accuses the Jesuits, 291
attacks S. Francisco de Borja, 293
Cano, Melchor, *el Extático*, 272
Cano, Miguel, abjures Illuminism, 395
Canonization, difficulties of, 329
of Santa Teresa, 231, 286
of San Juan de la Cruz, 288
of San Francisco de Borja, 293
of San José de Calasanz, 295
of crucified children, 461
attempted, of Bishop Palafox, 202
of Madre Agreda, 323
Capellades, paper mills of, 153
Capitulations of Granada, 460
Carcel de Amor, 95
Carlos III., his severity, 63
defends Mésengui's Catechism, 120
asserts independence of Rome, 122
restricts censorship of Inquisition 137
limits functions of Royal Council, 146
censorship of medical books, 147
recognizes episcopal censorship, 152
regulates censorship in Navarre, 157
simplifies censorship, 157
centralizes censorship, 158
revives law of Isabella, 159
regulates journalism, 166
urges canonization of Palafox, 203
Carlos IV. enforces law of 1558, 63
his press law of 1804, 143
restricts publication of state affairs, 146
his reactionary policy, 163, 165
suppresses newspapers, 166, 167
reorganizes the censorship, 168
his law of 1805 revived in 1814, 176
Carlos, Don, his rebellion, 180
Carmelites, their quarrel with Jesuits, 75
quarrels in the Order, 284
Carranza, Angela, case of, 375
Carranza, Archbishop, on vernacular Scripture, 45, 48
defence denied to him, 75
stops the smuggling of heretical books, 91
on incorporation with Holy Ghost, 235
on illumination by Holy Ghost, 236, 278
faith and charity requisite, 240, 279
his religious activity, 270
his *Comentarios*, 271
his mysticism, 272
his condemnation, 279
Carriers of heretic books, 67
Cartillas, price fixed for, 143
Carvajal, Luis de, attacks Erasmus, 41
Casas, Padre, disbelieves the Granadan forgeries, 111
Castel Rodrigo, Marquis of, 154
Castile, earliest censorship in, 18
Castillo, Francisco del, 306
Castillo, Isabel del, 390
Castro, Alfonso de, on use of Scripture, 44, 46
on need of censorship, 59
on books by heretics, 66
Castro, Leon de, his troubles with censorship, 196
Castro, Pedro de, Abp. of Granada, 108
Catalina de Jesus, her visions, 230
Catalina de Jesus, her condemnation, 307
Catalina, Queen, 446
Catalonia, manifesto of, prohibited 83
exportation of rags forbidden, 153
censorship established in, 154
Catenacci, his translation of Acts of Apostles, 160
Catharan Scriptures prohibited, 17
Causadas, Juan de, burnt for Molinism, 388

Cazalla, Bishop, 253
Cazalla, María, on vernacular Scripture, 46
errors attributed to, 246
her trial, 253
Cebrian, Joseph, 414
Celestina, the, 201
Censors or examiners, 140
responsibility imposed on them, 169
Censorship of the Press, 15
Centellas, Gaspar de, his trial, 50
Cervantes, expurgation of, 81
its cause, 240
Cevallos, Jerónimo de, his work condemned, 127
Chamizo, Cristóbal, an Alumbrado, 298
Charles I. (Engl.) visits Luisa de Carrion, 352
sends message to her, 354
Charles V. (Emp.) favors Erasmus, 31, 35
prohibits some of Erasmus' books, 42
his Formula of Reformation, 48
establishes censorship, 57
his edict of 1554, 58
his belief in Magdalena de la Cruz, 333
Charity, works of, to be avoided, 240
necessary in pious works, 241, 279
Chieti, Jews of, 439
Chiribaga, Francisco de, his visions, 322
Choir-books, censorship of, 61, 62
Christ, personation of, 218
Christians forbidden to read Gentile books, 15
Chumacero, Juan de, his memorial, 128
Church, the, its altered policy, 29, 44, 244
as to mysticism, 384
Clandestine publications, 184
Clara, beata, of Madrid, 413
Classic poetry suppressed, 72
Classics, mystic works used as, 216
Clement VII. favors Erasmus, 33, 41
Clement VIII. condemns Erasmus, 34
confirms independence of Spanish Inquisition, 101
claims the *Plomos del Sacromonte*, 111
his use of censorship, 126
Clement XI. his quarrel with Philip V. 131
Clement XI. tries Bishop de Toro, 390
regulates exorcism, 424
Clement XIII. condemns Mésengui's Catechism, 119
approves Palafox's works, 202
Clement XIV. and the *Encyclopédie*, 96
on María de Agreda, 325
Cobos, Vicente Pastor de los, 396
Cœlestis, bull, 468
Cœna Domini, bull, 59, 66
prohibited by Philip II. 99
Colloquies of Erasmus, used in schools, 34
Colon, José, case of, 174
Colonies, censorship of books on, 145, 169
Competencias, 125
Conception, Christ's, place of, 325
Concordat of 1851, 183
Conde, Cristóbal, his forgeries, 116
Confession, retraction of, 477
Confessional, use of, for censorship, 65
Congregation of the Index, 79
condemns Moya's *Opusculum*, 103
condemns Poza, 104
permits vernacular Scripture, 160
Congregation of Inquisition refuses to condemn Moya's *Opusculum*, 103
suspends the *Plomos del Sacromonte*, 112
orders Quietist associations dispersed, 385
Congregations, Roman, their decrees not recognized in Spain, 99
they assert supremacy, 101
Constantine forbids Arian writings, 16
Constitution of Cadiz, 174
revived in 1820, 177
modified in 1837, 180
Constitution of 1876, 182
Contemplation, mystic, 223
Convents, printing forbidden in, 150
demonic possession in, 311, 426, 436
Conversos, their persecution, 437, 469
Copies required from authors, 206
Córdoba, *auto de fé* of 1681, 383
Molinists punished in, 388
auto of 1749, 395
suppression of Inquisition in 1820, 414
Corrector General, his functions, 140
abolished by Carlos III. 157

Corruption protected by censorship, 189
Córtes of Cadiz in 1810, 172
Cortés, Juan Lucas, applies for reading licence, 94
Costa, José da, convicts an impostor, 336
Costal, Juan Antonio, 383
Cristina appointed regent, 180
Cristóbal de la Cruz, his letter to the Virgin, 366
Cronicones, the, 117
Crucifixion of children by Jews, 439
Cuenca, Beata de, 398
Cult of el Santo Niño, 467
Cum meditatio, bull, 59
Curiel, Luis, his treachery rewarded, 132

DANGERS of mysticism, 221, 233
Dante, expurgation of, 81
Death penalty, 57, 60, 61, 62, 63, 66, 67
Decadence of Spain, causes of, 188
Defence allowed to authors, 75, 137
Dejamiento, 248, 253
Delays of censorship, 193, 196
Demoniacs, 311, 401, 410, 423, 428, 435
Demons, deceptions of, 328
exorcism of, 424
Denunciation, duty of, 73, 199, 249, 302, 471
Desplugas, Gilabert, 471, 473, 479
Desplugas, María, 473
Devils, casting out of, 423
Dexter, Chronicle of, 117
Deza, Diego, persecutes Nebrija, 24
Diabolical possession, 423
cure of, 425
tests of, 427
Diario de Madrid, 167
Diccionario Crítico-burlesco, 175
Dictionnaire Encyclopédique, 96
Diez, Pedro Pablo, case of, 389
Discouragement of authorship, 207
Disease, cure of, 360
Disengaño del Hombre prohibited, 73
Dolores, María de los, case of, 397
relation of her *auto de fé*, 505
Domenguito del Val, 440
Dominicans oppose the Granadan forgeries, 111
mystics, 214
Molinism among, 390
Douceline, St. 213
Dreams, revelations by, 359
Du Moulin, Charles, his book condemned, 78, 100

ECHAGARAY, María Bárbara, 408
Echeverría, Juan de, his forgeries, 116
Eck, Dr. John, his theory as to Jews, 443
Ecstasy, 228
Edict of Denunciations on Scripture, 54
on forbidden books, 65
influence of, 199
on Illuminism, 149
Edict of Grace of 1623, 302
Edict on Molinist errors, 394
Editions, new, licence for, 61
Ejercicio de las tres potencias, 291
Elias, a pseudo-prophet, 415
Elucidarium Deiparæ of Poza, 104
Embusteros, 245, 328
Emmerich, Anna Kath. 326, 420
Enchiridion, the, of Erasmus, 36, 242
Endemoniadas, 423
of San Plácido, 311
Engelbrecht, Johann, 228
England, expulsion of Jews, 438
massacre of Jews in 1189, 440
canonization of Hugh of Lincoln, 461
Episcopal censorship, 16, 23, 25
prohibited, 152, 156
in Aragon, 152
in Navarre, 157
revived, 169
in 1824, 179
in modern Spain, 185
jurisdiction, 72
licence, 61
non-residence, 271
Erasmists, persecuted for Illuminism, 255
Erasmus, his career, 30
list of his errors, 40
condemnation of his books, 43
on external observances, 242
Espino, Juan de, his quarrel with Poza, 106
his persecution, 204
Estacionarios, supervision over, 17
Esterero santo, el, 358
Estienne, Robert, his troubles with the censorship, 52
Estius, Nicholas, on charitable works, 240

Examination, preliminary, 23, 58, 61
Examiners of books, 74, 169
Exorcism of demons, 424
formulas of, 425
Exorcistæ, 424, 436
Expenses of censorship, 141, 206
Expulsion of Jews from Spain, 460
Expurgation, 76
Exsurge Domine, bull, 27
Extortions of censorship, 206
in *visitas de navios*, 89
Eymeric, books burnt by him, 19

FARINACCI on reading heretic books, 67
Fasting, prolonged, 219, 332, 347, 354, 414
Fathers, expurgation of the, 78, 84
Fé de erratas, 140
Fees of censorship, 141
reduced by Carlos III. 157
increased by Carlos IV. 170
Ferdinand, King, controls papal bulls, 98
favors the Beata of Piedrahita, 220
and Isabella, first censorship, 22
expulsion of Jews, 460
Ferdinand VI. patronizes the Sacromonte. 115
censorship of medical books, 147
Ferdinand VII. reaction under, 175
suppresses newspapers, 176
his enforced liberalism, 177
his renewed absolutism, 178
Fernandez, Francisco, case of, 374
Summary of Evidence, 494
Fesque, Jean, case of, 68
Feyjoo, Padre, on the *Cronicones*, 118
on intellectual condition of Spain, 208
Fines, 141
First Class of authors in Roman Index, 66
Fita, Fidel, S. J. 439
Flanders, libraries and bookshops purged, 84
Florence, synod of, in 1625, limits exorcism, 424
Flores, Juan de, his forgeries, 115
Formulas of exorcism, 425
France, expulsion of Jews, 438
Francisca de la Concepcion, 296
Franciscan mystics, 213
Illuminism among, 252
Molinism among, 390
Franciscans defend Luisa de Carrion, 355
Franco, Jucé, his trial, 450
his burning, 459
Fray Gerundio, 205
French books, dread of, 163
prohibited in 1814, 176
Fuente, Alonso de la, attacks the Jesuits, 291
attacks Alumbrados, 295

GACETERO, 165
Galba, Miguel de, 258
Galindo, Padre, 322
Gallardo, Bart. José, case of, 175
Garci-Alvarez, 285
García, Benito, 448, 453, 466
Garibay, Esteván de, as censor, 82
his tribulations, 193
Gentile books forbidden to Christians, 15
Germany, early censorship in, 22
expulsion of Jews, 438
crucifixion of children, 441
cult of martyred children, 462
Gerson, John, on false and true visions, 328
Gigante, Hiercn., on non-residence of bishops, 271
Giudice, Card. condemns Macanáz, 132
Godoy Alcántara on the *Plomos del Sacromonte*, 110
Gorvea, Manuel, case of, 435
Gracian, Jerónimo, recommends Bible reading, 49
his Quietism, 226
discourages visions, 231
on inspiration, 237
his persecutions, 288
distrusts a beata, 337
Granada, forgeries at, 108, 115
auto de fé of 1778, 396
capitulation of, 461
Gregory XIII. confirms independence of Spanish Inquisition, 101
condemns Carranza, 279
praises Luis de Granada's writings, 282
separates the Carmelites, 287
approves of María de la Visitacion, 338
his bull against the Jews, 442
Gregory XV. withdraws licences for readers, 93
canonizes Teresa, 231, 286

Guadalajara, mystics of, 248
Gubiel, Luis de, his argument condemned, 125
Guevara, Ant de, expurgation of, 81
Guida Spirituale of Molinos, its condemnation, 327

HANZ de Brunsvique, case of, 71
Haro, Lopez de, his *Nobiliario*, 144
Hebrew books prohibited, 53
Bible an evidence of heresy, 470
Henriquez, Camilo, case of, 170
Henriquez, Henrique, his work condemned, 126
Heretic books introduced in Spain, 27, 85, 91
Hernandez, Constanza and Antonia, 383
Hernandez, Diego, tried for Illuminism, 254
Hernandez, Francisca, her relations with María Cazalla, 254
compromises her friends, 255
her trial, 259
her detention, 266
Hernandez, Juliano, 59, 69
Herp, Henry, on loss of self-control, 227
his works expurgated, 244
Herraiz, Isabel María, 398
Higuera, Roman de la, 117
Hijar y Mendoza, Ignacio de, 382
Historia Profetica, censure of, 75
Holy Ghost, incorporation with, 235
illumination by, 276
Hopelcheen, prohibition of books in, 73
Host, sacrilege attributed to Jews, 444
sorcery committed with, 447
Hours of the Virgin, translations of, prohibited, 53
Hugh, St. of Lincoln, 440, 461
Hungary, Passover sacrifice in, 444
Hysteria in mysticism, 228
in demonic possession, 433

ILLESCAS, his *Historia Pontifical*, 196
Illuminati, 213
Illuminism, 214, 235
errors of, 250, 302
Images, censorship of, 87
Immaculate Conception, forgeries in aid of, 109, 117
proved by Madre Agreda, 324
proved by Angela Carranza, 378
Impeccability, 214, 234, 276
attributed to Alumbrados, 248
Importations, supervision of, 84
under Carlos III. 159
in 1824, 179
burdens on, 207
of binding prohibited, 158
Impostors, 328
Imposture in diabolical possession, 427
Independence of Spanish Inquisition, 93, 96
of Spanish censorship, 129
Index, ordered to be printed, 60
publication of, 72
of 1559, 63, 64
subsequent ones, 79
revived in 1815, 177
Roman, in modern Spain, 185
Index Expurgatorius, 77
Indies, heretic books sent to, 29
visitas de navios in, 86
censorship of books on, 145, 169
Indulgences, disregarded by mystics, 243
Influence of censorship, 187
Inmestar, crucifixion at, 439
Innocent I. restricts exorcism, 424
Innocent X. and the *Plomos del Sacromonte*, 113
Innocent XI. condemns Moya's *Opusculum*, 104
condemns the *Plomos del Sacromonte*, 114
approves the *Guida Spirituale*, 327
Inquisition, its censorship in Aragon, 18
not at first a censor, 21, 23
assumes censorship, 24
it protects Erasmus, 38
its preliminary censorship, 57
its political censorship, 74, 83
its functions, 71
its expurgatory labors, 77
its executive duties, 84
its *visitas de navios*, 85
assumes control over licences to read, 93
uses censorship for aggrandizement, 125, 130
its triumph over Philip V. 133
restricted by Carlos III. 137

Inquisition permits vernacular Scriptures, 161
renewed rigor of censorship, 163
importations supervised by, 164
renewed activity of, 170
reinstated by Ferdinand VII. 176
finally suppressed, 178
its influence, 189
represses mutual hostility of religious Orders, 205
its position towards mysticism, 245
it persecutes the mystics, 252
it prosecutes impostors, 328
it suppresses Molinism, 384
its jurisdiction over demoniacs, 428
its introduction in Spain, 438
it suppresses uncanonized saints, 468
Inquisitors can read heretic books, 92
Inspiration in mysticism, 236
Instruction, religious, lack of, 217
In tanta librorum, bull, 160
Intervention, divine, habitual, 218
Intolerance, modern, in Spain, 186
Invisible world, intercourse with, 218
Isabella, Queen, her encouragement of learning, 20
prohibition of Scripture ascribed to her, 44
Isabel, Empress, intervenes for Francisco Ortiz, 267
her belief in Magdalena de la Cruz, 333
Isabel II. urges canonization of Madre Agreda, 326
Isabel de la Cruz, 252
Isabel de la Cruz of Jerez, 319
Isla, Francisco de, his *Fray Gerundio*, 205

JACOPONE da Todi, 214
James St., his Spanish apostolate, 109
Jarra de agua, 448
Jayme I. prohibits Romance Scriptures, 17
Jayme II. laws concerning book sellers, 17
Jesuit college of Madrid, 207
Jesuits, their quarrel with Carmelites, 75
they support Mateo Moya, 103
they support Juan B. Poza, 105
their attacks on Mésengui, 119
Jesuits, their struggle with Palafox, 202
their mysticism, 291
mystics of Seville, 301
their attitude towards Luisa de Carrion, 355
Jews their position in Spain, 437
crucifixion of children, 439
sacrilege with Host, 444
sorcery with Host, 447
forced to conversion, 469
their observances proscribed, 470
Joan, Pope, her story expurgated, 198
John of Jerusalem, his sanctity, 75
Joseph, King, his legislation, 173
Josepha de San Luis Beltran, 362
application for her arrest, 490
Journalism in Spain, 165
suppression of, 176, 178
recent laws on, 183
its extent, 187
Journals, French, efforts to exclude, 164
Juan II. orders Villena's books burnt, 18
Juan de Ávila, his works as classics, 217
censorship of his works, 222
his persecution, 256
on demonic deceptions, 328
Juan de la Cruz, San, his Quietism, 225
his prophetic power, 233
his impeccability, 234
pious works superfluous, 239
his persecutions, 286
Juan de Jesus, 358
Juan de Llotger, his censorship, 19
Juan de San Estebán, 391
Juana la Embustera, 358
Juana, Infanta, her edict of 1558, 59
Jubilee, papal, suppressed, 68
Jubileo circular, 387
Judaism, Christian, 242
Judges, penalties imposed on, 62
Juez de Imprentas, 142
supreme over literature, 169
Julius II. investigates the Beata of Piedrahita, 220
Julius III., his bull *Cum meditatio*, 59
withdraws licences for readers, 92
confirms independence of Spanish Inquisition, 101
Junqueras, Aldonza, 471, 472
Junta de Comercio, its special censorship, 145
Jury-trial for press offences, 177, 182

Justification by faith, 243
Justinian prohibits Nestorian books, 16

KILMASTI Cassaba, persecution of Jews in, 443

LA CADIÈRE, her stigmata, 421
La Granada, 301
La Guardia, cult of el Santo Niño 467
Laminæ Granatenses, 108
Laodicæa, Council of, on exorcists 424
Lara, María de, case of, 395
Lardizabal, Miguel de, case of, 174
Lateau, Louise, her stigmata, 421
Lateran, Fifth Council of, establishes censorship, 25
Las Casas, his controversy with Sepúlveda, 57, 200
Lazzari, Domenica, her stigmata, 420
Lee, Dr. Edward, assails Erasmus, 37, 39
Legal papers free from censorship, 61
subjected to censorship, 147, 149
Legend of el Santo Niño, 463
Leo I. prohibits Priscillianist books, 16
Leo X. establishes censorship, 25
prohibits Luther's books, 27
favors Erasmus, 32
Leo XII. condemns Madre Agreda's work, 326
Leo XIII. reopens the case of Madre Agreda, 326
Leon, Alfonso de, denounces Calderón, 314
Letters of heretics, 67
Liberty of the press declared in 1810, 173
under existing laws, 182
Libraries, inspection of, 60
purging of, 84
in 1824, 179
Licence to print, first requirement of, 25
establishment of, 38, 58, 61
not to be printed in the book, 158
unlicensed books burnt, 57
Licences to print abroad, 150
Licence to read forbidden books, 59, 64, 91
Life-guard, history of, prohibited, 208
Light within, the, 236
Lima, censorship in, 170
Lima, mystical impostures in, 375
Lincoln, crucifixion at, 440
Lisbon, *auto de fé* of 1761, 396
Literature, Spanish, condition of, 207
Llana, Fran. Murcia de la, 79
Llerena, Alumbrados of, 296
Longas, Juan de, case of, 392
Lope de Barrientos, books burnt by him, 18
Lopez, Gregorio, 280
Lopez, José de Ramos, 116
Lopez, Manuela, case of, 396
Lopez, María de los Dolores, 397
Louvain, Index of, 48
Lovitz, Jews burnt in, 447
Loya, Vicente de, case of, 393
Loyola, Ignatius, his persecution, 258
his mysticism, 291
distrusts Magdalena de la Cruz, 332
Lucrecia de Leon, 359
Luis de Granada recommends reading of Scripture, 49
his works as classics, 217
censorship of his works, 222, 282
his description of contemplation, 224
disbelief in revelations, 230
on inspiration, 236
his mortifications, 239
on works of charity, 240
escapes persecution, 281
believes in María de la Visitacion, 338
Luisa de Carrion, case of, 352
Luis de Leon, his works as classics, 217
Lusignan, Étienne de, on María de la Visitacion, 338
Luther's books, burning of, 27

MACANÁZ, Melchor Rafael de, 132
Madera, Greg. Lopez, on the Granadan forgeries, 111
Madrid, *auto de fé* of 1680, 251, 383
of 1802, 413
Magdalena de la Cruz, 330
Malaga, *visitas de navios* in, 88
Mamachi, censorship of his work, 138
Manifesto of Ferdinand VII. 175
Manrique, Inquisitor General, protects Erasmus, 35, 38, 41
his disgrace, 42
his tendency to mysticism, 241
orders detection of Alumbrados, 249

Manrique orders Francisca Hernandez tried, 263
Manuscripts, examination of, 23, 61
rubrication of, 140
Maps, censorship of, 147
María de la Cruz, 357
María de la Encarnacion, 362
María del Espiritu Santo, 391
María de la Visitacion, 338
María de S. José, her troubles, 285
Mariana, censorship of, 83
Mariano, Padre, 290
Marieta his *Historia Eclesiastica*, 77
Marin, Vidal, his Index, 79
Mari-Nuñez, 254
Marot, Clément, his Psalms, 68
Martin, Francisca Teresa, 389
Martini, his version of the Bible, 160
Mayans y Siscar on intellectual condition of Spain, 209
Mayr, Don, his torture, 446
Medical works, censorship of, 147
Meditation, mystic, 223
Mendez, Francisco, his mysticism, 300
his death, 305
Menendez y Pelayo on the Inquisition, 190
Menghi's works prohibited, 425
Mental prayer, 223
its sufficiency, 238
is a sacrament, 303
Mercier, Louis Sébastien, 159
Meschunadim, 437
Mésengui, Catechism of, 118
Metz, crucifixion in, 443
Mexia, Francisca, case of, 428
Mexican boundary, case of, 171
Inquisition, its jurisdiction, 73
Mexico, mystical impostures in, 362, 400
Miguel, San, as patron of Spain, 361
Ministro de las Imprentas, 143
supervises journals, 166
Minuteness of censorship, 147
Miracles of the mystics, 231
of Magdalena de la Cruz, 331, 332
of María de la Visitacion, 339
of Luisa de Carrion, 353
of *El Santo Niño*, 465
Misnia, crucifixion in, 441
Mohedano, his *Historia literaria* prohibited, 210
Molinism, extension of definition, 395
Molinistas, 384
Molinos, Miguel de, his Quietism, 226
on prophecy and miracles, 232
his doctrine of evil thoughts, 249
Molinos admires Gregorio Lopez, 280
abandons Spain, 327
his condemnation, 384
Monçon, Córtes of, 1599, 153
Montano, Árias, his *Biblia Regia*, 52
on expurgation of Ratramnus, 78
his Index, 79
purges libraries of Flanders, 84
disbelieves the *Plomos del Sacromonte*, 111
expurgation of, 190
Morals, care of, in censorship, 74, 83, 201
Mörl, Maria von, her stigmata, 420
Mortifications, various opinions on, 225, 239
Moya, Mateo, contest over his *Opusculum*, 102
Mudejares, 460
Munich, crucifixion at, 441
Mystical theology, its superiority, 241
Mystics, 213

NARVÁEZ, General, banishes Sor Patrocinio, 420
Narváez, Luis Pacheco de, denounces Quevedo, 199
Navarre, censorship in, 156
Navarrete on grammar schools, 191
Navarro, Joseph Luis, case of, 385
relation of his *auto de fé*, 501
Nebrija, Ant de, his persecution, 24
Nestorian writings prohibited, 16
Netherlands, libraries and book-shops purged, 84
New Granada, Molinism in, 399
Newspapers, 165
suppressed by Ferdinand VII. 176
suppressed in 1823, 178
recent laws on, 183
their number, 187
Nicholas of Egmond denounces Erasmus, 30
Nicklutsch, Crescenzia, her stigmata, 420
Niño el Santo, de la Guardia, 437
Norwich, boy crucified at, 439, 440
Nostradamus, his prophecies prohibited, 73
Novels, prohibition of, 95
Nudities subject to censorship, 201
Nuns of San Plácido, case of, 310
rules for exorcising, 426

OAXACA, demoniacs in, 435
Obra de Misericordia, 415
Obregon, Gerónima de, 373

Observances, Jewish, punished, 470
Ocaña, illuminated fraile of, 221
Olivares, his relations with the Inquisition, 83
his anxiety for an heir, 313
favors the nuns of San Plácido, 317
visions contributing to his fall, 322
has Luisa de Carrion prosecuted, 353
Olivitos y Esquinel, Angela, 375
Olmillos, Juan de, 252
Oral prayer, its subordination, 238
Orthodox sensitiveness, 470
Ordenamiento de Doña Catalina, 446
Orders, religious, censorship in, 140
mutual hostility between, 205
Organization of Censorship, 56
Ortí y Lara on the Inquisition, 189
Ortiz, Francisco, his *De Ornatu Animæ*, 58, 269
on influence of God, 235
errors attributed to, 247
his trial, 261
his retirement and death, 269
Osma, Pedro de, his writings burnt, 18
Osuna, Francisco de, his sermons, 57
his description of *recojimiento*, 223, 226
his disbelief in revelations, 230
definition of Union, 235
on mental prayer, 238
on mystical theology, 241
on uselessness of works, 243
his relations with Francisca Hernandez, 259

PACHECO, his Edict of Grace, 302
Palacios, Gertrudis and Josepha, 401
Palafox y Mendoza on the Jesuit Poza, 107
his persecution, 202
his mysticism, 320
Palafox, Jayme de, Archbishop of Seville, 385
Pallavicino on the Vulgate, 47
Palma, Jews persecuted in, 441
Papal bulls, their treatment in Spain, 99
authority ignored by mystics, 243
Papenbroek, Father, and the Carmelites, 75
Paper, quality of, regulated, 153
Paramo on the Alumbrados, 299
Parra, Francisco de la, 391
Passau, massacre of Jews, 445
Passionei, Cardinal, his death, 119
Passover bread, eating of, 478
sacrifice attributed to Jews, 439
Pastrana, mystics of, 248
Judaism in, 251
Patiño, Teresa, case of, 435
Patrocinio, Sor, case of, 416
Patron saints of Spain, 282, 322, 361, 468
Paul III. favors Erasmus, 33
his bull in *Cœna Domini*, 59
recognizes independence of Spanish Inquisition, 101
Paul IV. condemns Erasmus, 34
authorizes Spanish Index, 64
withdraws licences for readers, 92
his Index not respected, 97
Paul V. beatifies S. Teresa, 286
Pedro de Alcántara, San, his moderation, 226
his sleeplessness, 227
on mental prayer, 238
on mortification, 239
Pedro of Valencia detects the Granadan forgeries, 108
Peña on reading heretic books, 66
on episcopal jurisdiction, 72
Penalties imposed on booksellers, 23, 50, 60, 148
for possessing prohibited books, 60, 66, 67
for press offences, 185
Penance for suspicion, 478
Perez, Antonio, his works prohibited, 83
Perez, Dr. Juan, his mission to Rome, 41
his Catechism, 69
Perez, Juan Bautista, exposes the Granadan forgeries, 111
Perfectibility in mysticism, 234
Periodicals, legislation on, 166
recent laws on, 183
their number, 187
Persecution of mystics, 251
Peru, an impostor in 1566, 336
mystical impostures in, 375
Peter, St., his mission to Spain, 118
Peter, Martyr, his account of a beata, 219
Philip II. Pragmatic Sanction of 1558, 59
protests against Tridentine censorship, 98
his treatment of papal letters, 98

Philip II., his encouragement of Du Moulin, 100
regulates price of *cartillas*, 143
requires books to be licensed in Aragon, 153
protects S. Teresa, 285
Philip III. supports the Regalistas, 127
seeks canonization of Gregorio Lopez, 280
makes Teresa patron of Spain, 282
visits Mariana de Jesus, 350
Philip IV. defends the *Plomos del Sacromonte*, 113
his contest with the papacy, 128
censorship of legal papers, 147
prohibits useless books, 207
endows the Jesuit College, 207
his relations with María de Agreda, 321
venerates Luisa de Carrion, 352
Philip V. succumbs to the Inquisition, 132, 483
limits functions of Royal Council, 146
reduces exactions, 206
Piedrahita, beata of, 219
Pilar, Nuestra Señora del, 118
Pius IV. allows works on science, 97
Pius V. forbids translations of Hours of Virgin, 53
relaxes the censorship, 97
approves Carranza's *Comentarios*, 279
Pius VI. approves of vernacular Bible, 160
favors the beata Clara, 414
Pius IX., his Index in Spain, 185
declares prohibited the *Mistica Ciudad*, 326
beatifies Mariana de Jesus, 351
Plomos del Sacromonte, 108
Poetry, classic, suppressed, 72
Political use of censorship, 74, 83
of visions, 231, 322, 340
of Luisa de Carrion, 352
of Sor Patrocinio, 416, 420
Popes, their favor for Erasmus, 32
Portero, the office of, suppressed, 157
Portonares, Andres de, his printing office, 51
his losses on Illescas, 197
Portrait of Palafox prohibited, 203
Posen, Jewish sacrilege in, 445
Possession, diabolical, 311, 369, 401, 410, 423
tests of, 427
Poza, Juan Bautista, 104
Prado y Cuesta, his Index, 79
his rigor as to licences, 95
Pragmatic Sanction of 1558, 59
Pragmática del Exequatur, 122
Prague, crucifixion at, 441
Prayer, oral, its subordination, 238
mental, 223
its sufficiency, 238
is a sacrament, 303
Preliminary examination, 23, 58, 61
Press law of 1502, 22, 57
of 1554, 58
of 1558, 59
of 1752, 151
of 1805, 169
of 1813, 175
of 1821, 178
of 1830, 179
modern, 182
of 1883, 183
Press, liberty of, declared in 1810, 173
Press offences, modern, penalties for, 185
Printers, penalties on, 23, 148
practically outlawed, 149
Printing abroad forbidden, 150
decline of, in Spain, 150
revives under Carlos III. 158
Printing offices, inspection of, 149, 170
Prints, censorship of, 63, 87, 163
Priscillian, his heresy, 77
Priscillianist books prohibited, 16
Propaganda of heresy, 27
of mysticism, 252
Prophecy, 232
Puente, Luis de la, recommends Bible reading, 49, 55
his mysticism, 294
Purging of literature in 1824, 178
Puyal, Atanasio de, 414

QUAKERISM, mysticism of, 236
Quarrels between the religious orders, 205
Queretaro, demoniacs in, 428
Quesnoy le Conte, demoniacs in, 426
Question de Amor, 95
Quevedo, his works denounced, 199
requests prohibition of his works, 201
on el Santo Niño, 468
Quia in futurorum, bull, 64
Quietism, 223, 225
Quietists, their associations broken up, 385

Quietud de espiritu, 226
Quinoñes, Francisco de, 252
Quiroga, his Indexes, 79
explains condemnation of mystic books, 222
praises Teresa's autobiography, 283
punishes Alonso de la Fuente, 292
favors Jerónimo de Ripalda, 293
Quiros, Joseph, case of, 199
Quotations of stocks prohibited, 167

RAGS, export of, forbidden. 153
Raguza, Ana, case of, 388
Ramos, Josepha, case of, 429
Ratisbon, crucifixion in, 442
Ratramnus, expurgation of, 78
Raynal's works, rigid prohibition of, 171
Readers, licences for, 91
Recojimiento, 223
its sufficiency, 238
distinguished from *dejamiento*, 248
Reformation, influence of the, 26, 244
Reformers, their propagandism, 27, 85
Regalistas, the, 124
Relation of the Three Secretaries, 456
Religious Orders, censorship in, 140
quarrels between, 205
Rémond, Fl. de, his licence to read, 93
Repertorium Inquisitionis on heretic books, 21
on vernacular Scripture, 44
on mysticism, 216
Responsibility entailed by censorship, 144
Revelations, 229
political use of, 231, 322, 340
doubtful character of, 329
Revolution, the, 157
in Spain, 171
of 1820, 177
Revolution, French, news of the, suppressed, 163
Reyes, Juana de las, case of, 429
Ribas, Miguel, 415
Ribera, Juan de, his persecution, 295
Ricci, Lorenzo, attacks Mésengui's Catechism, 119
Richard of S. Victor on contemplation, 223
on demonic deceptions, 328
Rickel, Dionysius, his works expurgated, 244
Riesco, the Inquisitor, 173, 175
Ripalda, Jerónimo de, 293
Ritual, books of, censorship of, 61, 62
Rivera, Hernando de, case of, 463
Roa, Juan de, his work condemned, 126
Roales, Francisco, his works burned, 204
Robertson's works, rigid prohibition of, 171
Rodriguez, Alfonso, his mysticism, 294
Rodriguez, Mateo, 358
Roman, Jerónimo, expurgation of, 82
Roman censorship not recognized in Spain, 99
recognized in 1830, 179
in 1880, 185
Roman Index, classification of authors in, 66
of 1559, not respected, 97
Expurgatory Index, 78
Roman licences invalid in Spain, 93
Romance Scriptures prohibited, 17
Rome, appeals to, forbidden, 100
its condemnation of the *Regalistas*, 126, 131
Royal Council, functions of, 58, 60, 61, 140
limitation of functions, 146
importations submitted to, 159
newspapers submitted to, 165, 166
relieved from censorship, 169
its functions restored, 170
Rulman Merswin, his Quietism, 226
Rubrication of MS., 61

SACROMONTE, *Plomos del*, 108
canons of, 114
Saint-Pierre's *Paul et Virginie* prohibited, 177
Salamanca, university of, 191
Salgado de Somoza, his works, 100
their condemnation, 127
Salomassy, Esther, case of, 444
Salvat, Salvadora, 471, 472
Salviati, Carlo, quotes the *Plomos del Sacromonte*, 113
Samadhi, 213
Sanchez, Francisco, his persecution, 192
delays of censorship, 196
Sandoval, his Index, 79
San Plácido, case of nuns of, 310
San Sebastian, *visitas de navios* in, 88, 90
Santander, Raymon de, his punishment, 164

San Tomás, convent of, 451
Santo Ladronicio, 90
Santo Niño de la Guardia, 437
use made of his case, 460
his legend and cult, 463
Santos de San Juan, Manuel, 134
Saragossa, crucifixion at, 440
Sarmiento, Pablo, his exorcisms, 430
School-books, licence for, 61
Schoolmen, disregarded by the mystics, 241
Scio de San Miguel, his Bible, 161, 181
Scripture, earliest prohibition of, 16
medieval translations of, 19
perversion of heretic versions, 43
prohibition of, 44
vernacular, suppressed in Spain, 55
permitted, 160
Secrecy of censorship, 75
Segovia, Jewish sacrilege in, 446
Self-control, loss of, in mysticism, 227
Sensitiveness of censorship, 81, 95
as to Jewish observances, 470
Seoul, missionaries accused in, 444
Sepúlveda, crucifixion in, 442
Sepúlveda, Juan Gines de, assails Erasmus, 41
his quarrel with Las Casas, 57, 200
Serna, Francisca de la, case of, 433
Serrano, Diego, prosecutes Calderón, 314
Seville, S. Teresa's troubles in, 284
mystics of, 300
auto de fé of 1624, 305
of 1627, 307
of 1630, 308
of 1781, 397
case of Joseph Luis Navarro, 385
Sfondrati, Cardinal, quotes the *Plomos del Sacromonte*, 114, 117
Ships, examination of, 85
Sigismund, Emperor, forbids worship of a pseudo saint, 462
Silva, Manuel Francisco de, 358
Silva, Teresa de, case of, 309
Simancas, Lorenza de, case of, 351
Simancas on heretic books, 65
Simeon, St., of Trent, 462
Sixtus V. condemns Erasmus, 34
Sleep, loss of, in mysticism, 227
Smuggling of heretic books, 27, 59, 69, 88, 90
Smyrna, Jews tempted in, 444
Solis's *Historia*, licences for, 145
Solorzano's work condemned, 128
Solorzano, his *de Jure Indiarum*, 145
Sorbonne, the, condemns Erasmus, 31
vernacular Scriptures, 46
Ch. Du Moulin, 78
Moya's *Opusculum*, 102
Maria de Agreda's work, 323
Sorceries of Jews, 447
Soto, the Beata de, 319
Soto, Francisco, tries the Alumbrados of Llerena, 297
Sotomayor, his Index, 79
prohibits Poza's works, 107
prosecutes nuns of San Plácido, 318
Sovereignty of the nation proclaimed, 173
Spanish Inquisition, independence of, 93, 96
confirmed by successive popes, 101
Specialization of censorship, 146
Speculative theology, its inferiority, 241
Spoliation of authors, 206
Stamford, John of, 461
State, the, its use of censorship, 130
censorship by the, 139
State affairs, censorship of works on, 146
increased rigor, 159
Stigmata, their frequency, 337
of the Beata de Soto, 320
of Magdalena de la Cruz, 332
of Maria de la Visitacion, 339
of Luisa de Carrion, 352
of Francisca Martin, 389
of Sor Patrocinio, 417
modern cases of, 420
Stock quotations prohibited, 167
Stole, use of, in exorcism, 425
Stuñiga, his attacks on Erasmus, 32, 36
Suaso, José, founds a Molinist sect, 415
Subjects of censorship, 74
Subscription publications prohibited, 168
Suffering in mysticism, 228
Superintendente de las Imprentas, 143
Suso, Henry, 214
on evil thoughts, 249
Suspicion, punishment of, 478
Swedenborg, his visions, 230

TALAVERA, Hernando de, his book condemned, 204
Tamarit, Agustin, his Molinism, 395
Tapas, 213

Taragona, Córtes of, 1592, 153
Tassa, 141
of Garibay's *Compendio*, 195
Teresa, St., prohibits Bible reading, 49
her works as classics, 217
description of *recojimiento*, 224
description of ecstasy, 228
her miracles and canonization, 231
her prophetic power, 232
on impeccability, 234
her inspiration, 236
is made patron saint of Spain, 282
her persecutions, 283
warns Jerónimo Gracian, 337
Tertullian on casting out devils, 423
Tests of diabolical possession, 427
Texas boundary, investigation of, 171
Theology, speculative, its inferiority, 241
Thiermar, Hilbrand, 442
Thuringia, crucifixion in, 441
Titingen, crucifixion in, 442
Tizla-Ezlar, trial of Jews at, 444
Toledo, *auto de fé* of 1529, 253
Toledo, Francisco de, on reading heretic books, 67
Toro, Bishop Joseph Fernandez, 390
Torquemada, his burning of books, 21
case of el Santo Niño, 449, 460
Torre Torpiana, forgeries of the, 108
Torrox, fanatics of, in 1887, 421
Torture, its use, 70
of water, 448
continuance of, 477
Toulouse, Council of, 1229, forbids Scriptures, 17
Tovar, Bernardino de, tried for illuminism, 22, 256
Trance, 228
Transactions of learned societies, 170
Transformation into God, 225, 235
Treaties, their reprinting forbidden, 146
Trent, crucifixion in, 442
canonization of St. Simeon, 462
Trent, Council of, on Erasmus, 34
on the Vulgate, 47
its action as to censorship, 98
on non-residence of bishops, 271
approves Carranza's *Comentarios*, 279
Tridentine Rules on books by heretics, 66
Index, not respected, 98
Typographical errors noted, 140
Tyrol, ecstatic women of, 420

UEBERLINGEN, crucifixion at, 441
Ulloa, Pedro de, attacks Molinos, 386
Union with God, 213, 223, 225, 228, 253
impeccability in, 235
Universities, early censorship in, 17
Unlicensed books burnt, 57
Unnecessary books prohibited, 207
Urban VIII. withdraws licences for readers, 93
rejoices at condemnation of Poza, 107
demands the *Plomos del Sacromonte*, 112
confirms S. Teresa as patron saint of Spain, 282
his bull *Cœlestis*, 468

VALDÉS, Alfonso de, protects Erasmus, 35, 41
Valdés, Juan de, on censorship, 38
his mysticism, 256
his *Doctrina cristiana*, 257
Valdés, Inquisitor General, his Index of 1551, 48
prohibits heretical Bibles, 50
his Index of 1559, 64
prosecutes Carranza, 271
mystic works prohibited by him, 222, 282, 293
Valencia, censorship in, 58, 154
Council of, 1565, 152
Valladolid venerates Luisa de Carrion, 353
feigned demoniac in, 427
murder of boy in, 441
Varon, Fray, expurgation of, 82
Vasquez, Rodrigo, an Alumbrado, 299
Vatable, the Bible of, 51
Vega, Juan de la, case of, 392
Vegas, Damian de, his relation of the Santo Niño, 457, 463
Vergara, Juan de, favors Erasmus, 35, 38, 41
tried for illuminism, 42, 255
Vernacular Scripture forbidden, 16
allowed in medieval Spain, 19
authorized by Rome, 47
forbidden by Charles V 48
forbidden by Inquisition, 53
permitted in 1782, 160
Vertiz, Joseph Bruñon de, 362
act of Accusation, 492
Viana y Bustos supports the Granadan forgeries, 115

Vienne, Council of, condemns illuminism, 215
Vila, his imprisonment, 186
Villada, Pedro de, 448, 451
Villalobos, Francisco de, complains of mystics, 219
Villalpando, Francisco, his book condemned, 138
Villalpando, Juan de, his condemnation, 307
his retractation, 484
Villanueva, Joaquin Lorenzo, on vernacular Scripture, 54, 161
Villanueva, Jerónimo de, and the nuns of San Plácido, 310, 317
Villaroja, Eusebio de, case of, 400
Villena, Marquis of, his books burnt, 18
Visconti, his exorcisms prohibited, 425
Visions, 229
political importance of, 231, 322, 340
doubts concerning, 329
Visitas de navios, 85, 481
Vives, Luis, favors Erasmus, 35
expurgation of his works, 190
Vizlant, Philip, prints the Bible, 20
Vulgate, the, its authoritative character, 47

WAISTCOATS, revolutionary, 163
Waldensian Scriptures prohibited, 17
Wall, Sir Richard, and Mésengui's Catechism, 120
Water torture, 448
Werner, St., canonized by Cardinal Branda, 462
Will, annihilation of the, 225
Works, controversy over, 238, 243

XIMENES, Cardinal, burns Arabic books, 21
protects Nebrija, 24
his favor for Erasmus, 32
suppresses vernacular Scripture, 45
his independence of Rome, 98
his trust in a *beata*, 217
favors the Beata of Piedrahita, 220

YBARRARAN, Pedro Fernandez, case of, 407
Yoga system, 213
Yucatan, prohibition of books in, 73

ZAMORA, his *Monarchia mystica*, 154
Zapata, his story of impostors, 218
Zapata, his Index, 79
Zapata family, cases of, 362
Zuñiga, Juan de, his liberality, 190
Zwinger, Theodore, expurgation of, 80

WORKS BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

A HISTORY OF THE INQUISITION OF THE MIDDLE AGES.

In three octavo volumes. Cloth, gilt tops, $9.00.

HE has chosen a subject of extreme interest and importance, and has treated it in a manner that leaves nothing to be desired with respect to erudition, while at the same time he has produced a thoroughly readable book, well arranged, full of incident, and vigorously written. Indeed, it is not too much to say that he has made a most notable contribution to our knowledge of the history of the Middle Ages, and that his work will be valued in proportion to the knowledge that his readers already have of the period on which he writes.—*London Saturday Review*, July 7, 1888.

We would particularly commend, for its brevity as well as clearness, Mr. Lea's exposition of the tendencies of Nominalism and Realism, and his account of Roger Bacon for its liveliness and lucidity. His work is one that we can safely recommend all who are interested in its subject to buy. They will be, in Lord Bacon's phrase, "fuller men" after reading it, and the "fuller men" they are before they read it, the better they will like it.—*Spectator*, March 30, 1889.

It is little to say now that he equals Buckle in the extent and surpasses him in the intelligent choice and regulation of his reading. He is armed at all points. His information is comprehensive, minute, exact, and everywhere sufficient if not everywhere complete. Not his acquaintance with rare books only, which might be the curiosity of an epicurean, but with the right and appropriate book, amazes the reader. Labours such as no man ever achieved before him or will ever attempt again. If Mr. Lea stands aloft, in his own domain, as an accumulator, his credit as a judge of testimony is nearly as high. The deciding test of his critical sagacity is his masterly treatment of the case against the Templars.—LORD ACTON, in *English Historical Review*, October, 1888.

The refutation by a critical examination of the allegations of their accusers—of the dark charges against the Templars; the striking presentment of the witch-craze; the brilliant study of the life of Joan of Arc, severally are illuminating utterances of high value. Incidentally, also, they serve to illustrate some of the best qualities of Mr. Lea's method and style—his method, in that, while in a sense episodic, they are knit firmly into the fabric of the work; his style, in that they are intense and dramatic without a trace of 'fine writing' and without the least sacrifice of purpose for effect.—*New York Critic*, July 7, 1888.

This masterly work is the most complete that exists on the history of the Inquisition from its origin to the Reformation. It is no small merit of the author to be familiar with the whole vast literature of the subject and to make no mistake in selection. Besides this, when the opportunity offers, he adds no little of his own; he has not spared research in all the archives and libraries of Europe to collect new and precious material. We must be permitted to enter into some detail to make our readers appreciate the importance of this work, which casts real honor on the author and his country.—PROFESSOR Tocco, in the *Archivio Storico Italiano*, 1890.

The last in point of time, this is the first and the only history of the Inquisition as to value. Independence, erudition, completeness, impartiality, are not the only, but the principal qualities which illustrate his narrative.—PROFESSOR COMBA, in the *Archivio Veneto*, Aug. 1888.

Lea's comprehensive and careful work on the Inquisition is a new proof that the critical method of historical research and presentation, that creation chiefly of the German spirit, has obtained recognition beyond the Atlantic. He is the first who has undertaken not only to write a complete history of the Inquisition from the original sources, but to treat this terrible phenomenon in a spirit which is tolerant even of intolerance, and he has understood how to present his subject in a manner which is equally stimulating to the cultured reader and to the special student. Pre-eminently excellent, through its close adherence to facts and clear apprehension, is the account of Huss and his trial, in which the satanic cunning of the system of the Inquisition is made especially apparent.—WILHELM BERNARDI, in the *Historische Zeitschrift*, 1889.

The author has neglected nothing to arrive at a profound knowledge of his subject; he has examined the vast literature, general and special, to which the Inquisition and heresy have given birth, and he knows it with exactitude. He has held in his hands the original documents, and when he has been unable to do so himself he has had valuable collaborators in Europe who have consulted the archives for him and collated MSS. Add to this the temperament of an historian, a criticism at once severe and judicious, a real talent of exposition, and you can understand how the author has been able to execute his plan.—PROF. E. MONTET, in the *Annales de Bibliographie Théologique*, 1888.

WORKS BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

HISTORY OF THE INQUISITION—*Continued.*

This is one of the most important contributions of the year to ecclesiastical history, a more comprehensive and profound survey of its subject than we have hitherto possessed.—DR. F. H. REUSCH, in the *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, 1888.

Prutz's book on the Templars is as little to be recommended for instruction as Schottmüller's, and for this we must have recourse to the spirited and profound presentation of the subject in Lea's History of the Inquisition.—DR. CARL WENCK, in the *Gottingische gelehrte Anzeigen*, April, 1890.

Therefore we prefer to all three (Prutz, Schottmüller and Ladvocat) the summary, unpretentious, but vigorous, well-informed and impartial, of Mr. H. C. Lea. The American historian has used only the printed documents, but he has read them all and he knows how to reason. Though he is not a specialist (his dissertation on the Templars is only a fragment of a great work) it is he who has seen most clearly; it is he whom we must read to obtain the most just and wise idea of the events in controversy.—C. V. LANGLOIS, in the *Revue Historique*, June, 1889.

PUBLISHED BY HARPER BROTHERS, NEW YORK.

AN HISTORICAL SKETCH OF SACERDOTAL CELIBACY IN THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

Second and enlarged edition. In one octavo volume of 682 pages. Cloth, $4.50.

THIS subject has recently been treated with very great learning and with admirable impartiality by an American author, Mr. Henry C. Lea, in his *History of Sacerdotal Celibacy*, which is certainly one of the most valuable works that America has produced. Since the great history of Dean Milman, I know no work in English which has thrown more light on the moral condition of the Middle Ages, and none which is more fitted to dispel the gross illusions concerning that period which Positive writers and writers of a certain ecclesiastical school have conspired to sustain.—*Lecky's History of European Morals*, Chap. V.

PUBLISHED BY HOUGHTON, MIFFLIN & CO., BOSTON.

SUPERSTITION AND FORCE.

ESSAYS ON THE WAGER OF LAW, THE WAGER OF BATTLE, THE ORDEAL AND TORTURE.

Third revised and enlarged edition. In one handsome royal 12mo. volume of 552 pages. Cloth, $2.50.

THIS valuable work is in reality a history of civilization as interpreted by the progress of jurisprudence. In "Superstition and Force" we have a philosophic survey of the long period intervening between primitive barbarity and civilized enlightenment. There is not a chapter in the work that should not be most carefully studied; and, however well versed the reader may be in the science of jurisprudence, he will find much in Mr. Lea's volume of which he was previously ignorant. The book is a valuable addition to the literature of social science.—*Westminster Review*, January, 1880.

STUDIES IN CHURCH HISTORY.

THE RISE OF THE TEMPORAL POWER—BENEFIT OF CLERGY—EXCOMMUNICATION—THE EARLY CHURCH AND SLAVERY.

Second edition, revised. In one large royal 12mo. volume of 603 pages. Extra cloth, $2.50.

MR. LEA is *facile princeps* among American scholars in the history of the Middle Ages, and, indeed, we know of no European writer who has shown such research, accuracy, and grasp in investigating important and out-of-the-way topics connected with the history of Europe in the Middle Ages.—*New York Times*, April 30, 1883.

PUBLISHED BY LEA BROTHERS & CO., PHILADELPHIA.

Date Due

O 29 '42
F 4 '46
F 19 '46
Mr 11 '46
MY 28 '46
MY 13 '53
MR1 '55
MY 24 '55
[redacted]
UNSELF

BX1735 .L433
Chapters from the religious history of
Princeton Theological Seminary–Speer Library
1 1012 00019 9440